

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 47XU F

621
Milner

Harvard Divinity School



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

MDCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

GIFT FROM
WIDENER LIBRARY



Painted by G. A. Kewen. Engr. 1800.

Engr. by G. B. Sill.

Rev. D. Wilner

✓

VINDICATION
OF
THE END
OF
RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY,
FROM THE EXCEPTIONS OF THE
RIGHT REV. DR. THOMAS BURGESS,
BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S,

AND THE

REV. RICHARD GRIER, A.M.

VICAR OF TEMPLEBODANE, AND CHAPLAIN TO EARL TALBOT, LORD LIEUTENANT
OF IRELAND:

IN

Letters to a Catholic Convert,

BY THE

ilner
REV. J. M., D.D. F.S.A.

PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY EUGENE CUMMISKEY.

William Brown, Printer.

1825.

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

H78, 055

Feb. 23, 1951

621
milner

(Widener)

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

Page

Introduction. Design of The END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.	
Design of the present VINDICATION; to show how completely the Right Rev. Bishop and the Rev. Vicar, who have undertaken to answer it, have failed in their attempt.	9

LETTER II.

Origin of the <i>End of Religious Controversy</i> . Dr. Sturges' <i>Reflections on Popery</i> . The Author's <i>Letters to a Prebendary</i> . The author deterred from pursuing the Controversy by a former Bishop of St. David's. The present Bishop of St. David's <i>Protestant's Catechism</i> . Brief Summary of <i>The End of Religious Controversy</i> . Fallacy of the Rules of private Inspiration and private Interpretation of Scripture. Security of the Catholic Rule: namely, the whole word of God as explained by the Catholic Church. Acknowledged Characteristics of the True Church; these visible only in the Catholic Church. Necessary falsehood of the Charges against her.	11
--	----

LETTER III.

Controversy with the Bishop of St. David's. Sketch of the <i>Protestant's Catechism</i> . Inconsistency and absurdity of its contents. The Bishop's THREE WORDS to General Thornton, and his ONE WORD to Dr. Milner. Insignificancy of <i>The One Word</i> .	15
--	----

LETTER IV.

The Bishop of St. David's GRAND SCHISM of the Sixteenth Century. Occasion and nature of this publication. New Paradoxes. Delivery of the Mountain. Fresh errors of his Lordship. His question here answered.	18
POSTSCRIPT.—Doctrinal variations of three eminent Episcopal Controversialists. B. Jewel's variations. His challenge at St. Paul's Cross. His notorious falsities and frauds, the cause of many conversions. His death-bed confession. B. Taylor's defence of the Catholic Religion. The occasion of his change. His own excuse for his change. A. B. Wake's virulent charges against the Catholic Church in terms of union with the Catholic Church of France.	25

LETTER V.

Page

Controversy with the Rev. R. Grier, A.M., &c. Prefatory Remarks, Character of his REPLY. Absurdity of its Motto. The Vicar's abuse of the present writer and his work. Insinuation of a disloyal tendency against the author's work. Mis-statements of the Vicar. Notes of the Rhemish Testament. False reasoning respecting Paine, Joanna Southcote, Luther, and Cranmer. The Vicar's excommunication of the Evangelicals, so called. The Vicar's confused and absurd charge of Schisms against the Catholic Church. His falsification of Panvini's Chronicle. His renewal of a refuted and known calumny. The Vicar and not the author guilty of falsifying authorities. The controversy between Dr. Burgess and Dr. Marsh. Vain attempt to deprive the Church of her distinctive title of *Catholic*. The Vicar's false professions. Comparison between the Bishop's and the Vicar's method of answering *The End of Controversy*. The latter's curious argument in favour of his method. His unexampled boasting and abuse. The real criterion of sound controversy. 34

LETTER VI.

CANON OF THE SCRIPTURES. The Rev. Vicar evades the chief arguments of *The End of Controversy*, and confines his disquisition to a few points of minor importance. Enlarged statement of questions relating to the Scriptures. Inconsistent analysis of the Vicar's Canon of them. A distinction of traditions, without a difference. The only means of ascertaining Scripture. Different errors of the Vicar concerning them. Learned Protestants derive the character of Scripture from Tradition. Misrepresentation and falsification of Hooker; also of Dr. Lardner, Chillingworth, and Wake, opposed to the Vicar; also to the Articles. The Pretended Vicious Circle. 45

LETTER VII.

Versions of THE ENGLISH BIBLE. The Vicar gives up The Inspiration of the Scriptures. His abuse of the present writer. His equal commendation of the two different Versions. Dr. Ryan's comparative candour. Infidelity of Tyndal's Version. Sir Thomas More's character of it. Character of Coverdale. The Vicar's curious vindication of the latter's Translation. His unbounded abuse of Martin and Ward. Protestant complaints of the Old Bible. Judgment of James I. concerning it. False translations in the present Bible. Comparison between the Vicar's justification of this version with that of Luther in defence of his. 54

LETTER VIII.

Variations of the Bible from its Originals. Fresh instances of the Vicar's attempt to reconcile the two parts of a disjunctive proposition. The originals of the new translation of the Bible. Departure of the Bible from the Hebrew Original. The Vicar first defends the latter and afterwards the former. His singular reasoning on both heads. The Testament departs from the Greek Manuscripts. The Vicar justifies this, and at the same time, misrepresents the present writer. His forced acknowledgment that the Latin Vulgate of the Testament is purer than the existing Greek originals, and, by inference, that

CONTENTS.

	Page
Tradition is more to be relied upon than written or printed copies of the word of God. Incidental controversy concerning the religious principles of the late B. Watson.	65

LETTER IX.

REAL PRESENCE and TRANSUBSTANTIATION.—Disingenuity of most Protestant Polemics on these points. Fruitless attempt of the Vicar to renew the charge of Idolatry against the Catholics. The Vicar's indignation at the general charge of disingenuity, of which he himself individually is the most guilty. Christ's <i>Real Presence</i> in the Sacrament, reduced by the Vicar and Dr. Burgess to the Universal Presence of his Divinity. Inconsistency of this doctrine.	74
---	----

LETTER X.

TESTIMONIES of the FATHERS for the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.—The most able Protestant Divines give up the Ancient Fathers to the Catholics. The Vicar claims them, through a rash "determination of depriving Dr. M. of their aid." S. Ignatius, B. of Antioch, in the Apostolic age. S. Justin, the Philosopher, in the second age. S. Cyprian in the third age. Origen, the Vicar unacquainted with his idiom. SS. Basil, Gregory of Nissa, Gregory Nazianzen in the fourth age. S. John Chrysostom, S. Jerom, S. Hilary, S. Augustine in the fifth age. The Vicar's reproach concerning Tertullian. Proofs of that Father's sentiments. The author's motive for quoting at greater length from SS. Cyril and Ambrose. Unparalleled boldness of the Vicar in his claim to the former. His calumnious fabrication against the character of the author. Testimonies of S. Cyril, in his analysis of the Ancient Mass. Doctrine of S. Ambrose in both of his quoted works. The Vicar's Un-Protestant, as well as Un-Catholic doctrine. Testimonies from P. Gregory the Great, Ven. Bede, and Alcuin. Declaration of the Second Council of Nice.	81
--	----

LETTER XI.

Pretended RISE of Transubstantiation.—Former Polemics uncertain about this pretended rise. Proofs that it never rose at all, since the institution of the Sacrament. Claud's <i>falsities</i> concerning Pascasius adopted by the Vicar, and refuted by the author. Berengarius, the first formal impugner of the corporal presence. The whole Church declares against him. His retraction on his death-bed. The Albigenses. Wickliff, Huss, and Luther, the latter's wish to attack the Real Presence. Variations of Cranmer, &c. in the Established Liturgy. The Vicar's self-contradiction on this subject. Sentiments of certain Protestant Divines. The Vicar's opposition to them. Testimony of the senses. The Vicar's final concession on that point.	96
---	----

LETTER XII.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.—Universality of the rite of Sacrifice. Promise of a more excellent Sacrifice to be instituted by Christ. Fulfilment of that promise. Doctrine of the Fathers. Identity of this with the Sacrifice on the Cross. Satan the first formal opponent of the Mass.	103
---	-----

LETTER XIII.

Page

- Communion under one kind.**—Inconsistency of Protestants in this matter. Christ whole and entire in the Catholic Communion. The mode of receiving, a point of variable discipline. This and other such points determined in England by the Civil power. Misrepresentation of the Vicar. Doctrine of the Oriental Churches. Proofs from Scripture. Testimonies of the Fathers. Absurdity and contradiction of the Vicar's doctrine. - 108

LETTER XIV.

- Absolution.**—Violence offered to Scripture by Dr. Porteus and the Vicar. Misrepresentation of Chillingworth. Impossibility of an imposition in this matter. - 122

LETTER XV.

- On Indulgences.**—A clearing up of this matter. Protestant Indulgences. The Vicar's New Table of Prices for Sins. Consecration of the Chapel at Cork. Character of the late Bishop Moylan. Call on the Vicar for Reparation. - 128

LETTER XVI.

- On Purgatory.**—Scriptural Proofs of a Middle Place. Proofs from the Fathers. The Vicar adopts Calvin's doctrine. Real ground of the abrogation of Prayers for the Dead in England. Usher's doctrine. Comparison between the Catholic burial service and that of the Common Prayer book. - 135
- POSTSCRIPT.**—Extreme Unction.—Forced contradiction of the Scripture by Dr. Porteus. Vain attempt of the Vicar to disprove this Sacrament. - 143

LETTER XVII.

- The Invocation of Saints.**—This not idolatrous. Feeble attempts of the Vicar against it. Vindication of the Church of England from the ill judged defence of it by the Vicar. Unfortunate argument of the Bishop of Durham. - 145

LETTER XVIII.

- On RELIGIOUS MEMORIALS.**—Reasons for the title of this Letter. The Vicar's charge of Idolatry against the Church on this head calumnious. Declaration of the Council of Trent, and the Catholic Catechism. Misrepresentation of the Scriptures. Impious language of the Vicar. His complaints of Queen Elizabeth's moderation. Extravagance of the Homilies. Division of the Commandments. The Vicar's violation of one of them. Cranmer's agreement with the Catholics. - 151

LETTER XIX.

- On ANTICHRIST.**—Unwarranted excesses of the Vicar on this sub-

	Page
ject. Awkward consequences resulting from them. Misrepresentation of the Church of England's doctrine. Absurdity of the Vicar's system. His false impeachment of the author's loyalty. His whimsical anagram.	155

LETTER XX.

On the Supremacy.—Different effects of Bigotry. Instance of this in the Vicar and A. B. Tillotson. Supremacy of St. Peter. This descends to his successors. Testimonies of the Fathers and the Councils. The Vicar's blunders concerning that of Sardica. His fresh imputation on the Vicar's loyalty. His ridiculous boasts of victory.	159
--	-----

LETTER XXI.

On PERSECUTION.—The Vicar's misrepresentation of the writer's sentiments and writings on this subject. Success of the latter against the Vicar himself. The latter's foul misrepresentations and calumnies. His errors in religious politics.	166
---	-----

LETTER XXII.

On MIRACLES.—The Vicar's high compliments of the writer. These dashed by equal contumely. The writer's real doctrine concerning miracles. Our Saviour's promise that they should be continued. Proofs that they have continued in the Catholic Church. Refutation of the Vicar's objections against them. Demonstration of B. Douglas's falsities on this subject. Recent Miracles. Consequences resulting from their continuance.	170
--	-----

LETTER XXIII.

Language of the LITURGY. Use of the Scriptures. The Vicar's abuse of terms. Latin not an unknown tongue. Propriety of the use of the English language by the Church of England. St. Paul's doctrine and practice. Our Saviour, Christ, frequented a service performed in an obsolete language. The Vicar, with the B. of St. David's, required to produce the Welsh Liturgy established by St. Paul.—The Vicar's confusion on the subject of the Scripture. The Rules of the last Council and practice of the Church concerning it. Fidelity of the Rheims Testament. The Vicar contradicts himself and the Bishop of St. David's concerning the unrestrained use of the Scripture.	178
---	-----

LETTER XXIV.

On CLERICAL CONTINENCY.—The Vicar's motive for starting this fresh subject of controversy. Occasion of the mis-translation of Mat. xix. 11. Distinctions to be made on this subject. False and absurd origin of this observance assigned by the Vicar. Refutation of his reasoning concerning it. His calumnies against P. Gregory VII.	182
---	-----

LETTER XXV.

CONCLUSION.—Ridiculousness of the Vicar's brags. He has proved no one point he took in hand, and has quite overlooked the object	
--	--

	Page
and chief contents of. The END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY. His absurd attempt to make up a true Catholic Church of all the false and contradictory heresies that have ever existed. The very small number of real members of the Established Church. Unity and Catholicity of the Great Original Church. Impossibility of a change in her Faith. Awful Memento!	188

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE PRESENT WORK.

AB. for Archbishop.	F. F. Fathers.
A.D. Anno Domini.	E. Emperor.
B. Bishop.	H. Holy.
Cant. Canterbury.	K. King.
C. P. Constantineple.	P. Page.
Dr. Doctor.	PP. Pages.
Dr. Burgess, The Rt. Rev. Bishop - of St. David's.	P. Pope.
Dr. Marsh, The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Peterborough.	S. Saint.
Dr. Porteus, The late Rt. Rev. Bi- shop of London.	SS. Saints.
Dr. Tomline, The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Winchester.	Vicar, The Rev. Richard Grier, A.M. Vicar of Templebodane, in the Dio- cess of Cloyne, and Chaplain to His Excellency Earl Talbot, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

VINDICATION,

&c. &c. &c.

INTRODUCTION.

LETTER I.

To a Catholic Convert.

DEAR SIR:—As it was not to perpetuate, but rather to terminate dissensions among Christians of different communions, by showing them the effectual means, appointed by Christ, and employed by the Church at all times for this purpose, that the author wrote **THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY**; so it is not to gain the easy triumph of refuting the Bishop of St. David's **GRAND SCHISM**, and the Vicar of Templebodane's **REPLY to the End of Controversy**, that he is now induced to vindicate his work from their cavils. You, dear Sir, will believe him, when he assures you that he feels to the very centre of his soul the sentiment therein expressed; namely, that there is no hypocrisy or imposture more detestable, or that will be exposed to more overwhelming confusion and severe chastisement, at the great accounting day, than that of Christian Ministers, who make the Gospel subservient to their vanity, their ambition, their avarice, or their resentment. Alas, my dear Sir, what answer should I make to your cries, and those of your fellow converts, for vengeance on my head at the bar of inflexible justice, had I led you into the abyss of idolatry, by inducing you to return to the bosom of your ancient mother the Catholic Church! And what alleviation would it be to my sufferings, in the dungeons of eternal misery, to have made you my partner in them!

Neither is it, my dear Sir, from any apprehension that the arguments of my Reverend and Right Reverend opponents will unsettle the faith of any one amongst you, or incline you to ex-

change the peace and conscious security of mind you now enjoy, for your former doubts and fears, that I follow up the present controversy; for it is not by the calumnies or arguments of her opponents that the Catholic Church loses any of her children: the experience of forty years in her service, and an extensive acquaintance with her history, are my warrants for making this assertion. No: there are other inducements, mentioned by an Apostle,* which have seduced, and must continue to seduce some of them to belie their consciences.† Nevertheless, as my more dignified opponent, whose rank gives an accidental weight to his words, publishes that “The End of Controversy affords no answer to his *Protestant’s Catechism*,”‡ and as his less polished ally has the assurance to charge me with “perverting passages from their meaning, with misquoting, garbling, adopting lying legends, &c.,” and more particularly as a noble Ex-Secretary of State has reconciled it to his religious feelings, to patronize these with other numerous calumnies,§ and to recommend them and their author to the Royal favour, it seems an act of justice, I owe to you and my other friends, and indeed to the public at large, to demonstrate how completely routed, and plunged into the abyss of absurdity and contradiction, the Bishop of St. David’s is, on all the leading points of his novel system; and to prove that the Rev. Mr. Grier, so far from substantiating his grievous charges against the writer and his religion, is himself convicted on each one of them. To few persons is the Apostle’s reproach more applicable than it is to the Vicar of Templebodane: *Wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself.*||

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours, &c. in Christ,

J. M., D. D.

* 1 John, ii. 16.

† This is frequently manifested at the death-bed scene of apostate Catholics. No person who renounced his religion, was less suspected of being influenced by worldly motives than the last Lord M*****e, who died at Brussels; yet, when he found himself on his death-bed, he never ceased conjuring his friends, his family, and his servants, to make it known, that the change of religion he had made, proceeded from *libertinism of principle and libertinism of practice*.—Since *The End of Controversy* was published, another Right Hon. personage, Lord Dunsany, has returned to the Catholic communion previously to his dissolution; and if a late Duke did not go that whole length, at least he did not die a member of the Church to which he conformed.

‡ The Bishop of St. David’s *One Word on Dr. Milner’s End of Controversy*, p. 16.

§ The Right Hon. Viscount Sidmouth, to whom the Rev. Mr. Grier’s book is dedicated.

|| Rom. ii. 1.

LETTER II.

Origin of "The End of Religious Controversy."

DEAR SIR:—You have learnt, from *The Address* prefixed to the work here mentioned, that the author of it, having been, above twenty years ago, forced into a public debate on religious subjects with a learned Prebendary of Winchester Cathedral, Dr. Sturges, and being prepared to follow up the success which the superiority of his cause gave him, by publishing a work, which would answer its title, namely, *THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY*, was prevailed upon to abandon his undertaking by the celebrated Dr. Horseley, then Bishop of St. David's, who had laid the author under obligations to him, by twice advocating his cause in Parliament. The work accordingly lay dormant, and was nearly forgotten,* till the present Bishop of St. David's published his *Protestant Catechism*, and other Anti-Catholic writers published, in great numbers, different books, pamphlets, and speeches, equally calumnious of the Catholics and their religion, and equally confused and discordant among themselves. In these circumstances, it appeared evident to the author that the only way of obtaining justice from those writers, for his religion, and of reducing them to terms of peace and consistency with each other, was to convince them of the necessity there is of discovering and following the *right rule of faith*. Destitute of this, we are all at sea without a compass, tossed to and fro *with every wave of doctrine*: possessed of this, we may keep a steady course, and arrive at the blessed harbour of unanimity and truth.

That Jesus Christ has left us the means of attaining to the truth of his religion, or, in other words, a *rule of faith*, I assumed as a principle, in which all thinking Christians must agree: the only question then is—which of the three following methods he has appointed for this purpose—an individual *private inspiration* or feeling, such as the Montanists of old pretended to be guided by, and the Quakers and some other modern

* One of the author's present opponents, the Rev. Mr. Grier, who never speaks with greater confidence than when he speaks of matters with which he is totally unacquainted, asserts that *The End of Controversy* "lay dormant in the author's study twice the period prescribed by the poet (eighteen years), receiving, each day, such embellishments from his master-hand as might exhibit his portraiture in its most attractive form."—*PREFATORY REMARKS*, p. iv.

Dissenters lay claim to at present? Or, Secondly, the *Holy Scriptures, as each individual may understand them?* Or, thirdly, *the whole word of God, whether written or unwritten*, as preserved and interpreted by the Great Universal Church of all ages and all nations? That the first of these methods is not the ordinary rule appointed by Christ to lead mankind to the truth of his religion, is proved by the author, where he shows, that it has led numberless persons into the very depth of folly, impiety, and wickedness. That the second method, that of each man's particular interpretation of Scripture, was not ordained by Christ to be this rule, is demonstrated by as numerous and as egregious instances of folly, impiety, and wickedness, which it has produced, and continues to produce among the discordant sects of Christians, who profess to follow Scripture as their only rule. In further proof that Christ did not appoint Holy Scripture to be the adequate rule of Christian faith, the author has observed, that Christ wrote no part of it; that he gave no orders to his Apostles to write any part of it, nor to his followers at large so much as to learn to read it. He added, in conclusion, what must strike every reflecting mind, that no state or society of men whatsoever could or can be governed, or so much as subsist, by means of mere written laws, without judges and magistrates to decide on their meaning, and to enforce their observance.

Proceeding to the third, or the Catholic rule of faith, namely, the entire word of God, whether written or unwritten, as preserved and interpreted by the Church of Christ (which implies that besides a rule of faith, Christ has also left a guardian and an interpreter of that rule), the author demonstrated that to follow this is the only right way of coming to the truth of religion. He showed, in the first place, that all written laws are grounded on unwritten laws; which he proved, with respect to the laws of England, by the testimony of Judge Blackstone, in his celebrated commentaries; and with respect to the rule of faith, by that of the Right Rev. Dr. Marsh, who acknowledges that "the unwritten word or tradition was the first rule of Christianity"* (but, without pretending to show when or how it lost its authority, in consequence of some part of the Christian truths being consigned to writing); hence he inferred that Divine Tradition must be of equal authority with Divine Scripture. He showed from the Gospel, that Christ sent his Apostles to *preach the Gospel to every creature*;† not to distribute Bibles throughout the universe: that the Apostles and their

* Comparative View, p. 61.

† Mark, xvi. 15.

successors followed this method of oral instruction, and converted, among the rest, whole tribes of people, who were not acquainted with the use of letters,* that many years, and even some centuries, must have intervened and did intervene before the different churches could compare together the different Gospels and Epistles in their possession, in order to determine which of them were genuine, and which spurious; which of them were of divine, and which only of human authority: while, in the mean time, the truths of Christianity continued to be preserved and propagated, chiefly by the tradition of the Church, which she had received from the Apostles: that this twofold rule of Scripture and Tradition, joined with the authority of the Church, was that to which the Holy Fathers and Doctors have at all times resorted for determining questions of faith and preserving Unity in the Church. Finally, the "Author has shown that it is still more presumptuous and foolish for an individual to insist upon explaining the Scripture for himself, contrary to the interpretation of the Catholic Church (which alone can vouch to him that the Scripture is genuine and inspired), than it would be for the same individual, having a cause at issue in any court, to rush into it, and snatching the statute-book out of the hands of the judges, to proclaim that he can explain it better than all of them put together.

The sincere Christian, having once found the right rule of Faith may be said to have arrived at THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY. He need not interrogate the hundreds and thousands of different sects of Christians which have branched off from the main stock, during the eighteen hundred years of her existence, what grounds they had for their several creeds and practices; he need not hunt through the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelations, to form a system of religion for himself, which, otherwise, that is to say if Scripture were his only rule, he would be bound to do. He has only to inquire, "*what does the Catholic Church of all ages and all nations teach? she that is the heiress of the promise of Christ? What doctrine has she received from the Apostles? How does she understand the controverted passages of the Scripture?*" For common sense, as well as duty, tells me to listen to her, in preference to all those varying sects, and to my own erring opinion.

But whereas some of the sectaries in question presume, at times, to dispute the claim of the Catholic Church to be the True Church of Christ, and either arrogate that title to themselves, or still more absurdly attribute it to all the contending,

* S. Iren. Advers. Hær. Tertul. Præscrip.

contradictory, and even impious and immoral sects, that call themselves Christians in common; and whereas the question, *which is the true Church of Christ?* admits of a more easy and convincing solution than the former question, *which is the right Rule of Faith?* The author has fully discussed this matter in the second part of his *END OF CONTROVERSY*, showing that there are four exterior characteristics, or visible marks of Christ's True Church, which are acknowledged to belong to it by all Christians who receive the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, *UNITY, HOLINESS, CATHOLICITY, and APOSTOLICITY*; they being contained in this article, *I believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.* He then goes on to prove, that these marks are clearly visible in the Catholic Church, and are wanting in every other Christian society; that she alone, though spread throughout the nations of the world, is exclusively *ONE*: all her children, every where, believing the same doctrines; practising the same religious rites of sacrifice and the sacraments; and acknowledging the same ecclesiastical authority: whereas the different societies of Protestants (to speak of them alone) are not only divided in all these respects from each other, but also disunited and differing each of them among themselves. He shows that the same Church is supereminently and visibly *HOLY*, in her *doctrine*, in her distinctive *practices of holiness*; in the *fruits of holiness*, which she at all times has produced, and in the *attestation of her sanctity* which God continues to afford her. It was an easy task for the author to prove that, as the true Church is *Catholic in name*, so she is *Catholic* or *Universal*, both as to time and place; nor was it more difficult to demonstrate to the eye, by an engraved genealogical Table, as well as to the reason by a sketch of Ecclesiastical history, that she alone is *Apostolical*, deriving her *Doctrine*, her *Orders*, and her *Mission* in regular succession, from the Apostles of Christ.

In the last place, though, in demonstrating *The Right Rule of Faith*, as the author has done, in the first part of his *End of Controversy*, and the *True Church of Christ*, as he has done in his second part of it, he has rendered it quite unnecessary to vindicate the Catholic Church from the several charges of idolatry, superstition, and error, with which too many Protestants cloak the fatal schism of their ancestors in separating themselves from her, yet, as those charges are easily refuted, being grounded on misrepresentation and calumny; and as the exposure of them seldom fails to open the eyes of some persons who have been the unfortunate dupes of them, the author has executed this task in the third part of his work. So empty is the boast of Jortin, which both Dr. Burgess and Mr. Grier repeat, as the

motto of their undermentioned performances, namely, that "no author has ever attacked the Catholic Church without giving it a mortal wound!" Strange; indeed, it would be, that she who has received so many *mortal wounds* at the hands of myriads of her enemies, from Simon Magus down to Martin Luther, and from Martin Luther down to Dr. Burgess and Mr. Grier, should still survive, and be even capable of intimidating such champions as they are; unless she remain fast bound in the chains of penal laws.

I am, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER III.

The Controversy with The Right Rev. Bishop of St. David's.

DEAR SIR:—It seemed to me necessary to remind you and my other friends, in the brief manner I have done, of what is contained in the END OF CONTROVERSY, that you may see how far the Bishop and the Vicar who have undertaken to answer it fulfil their engagements. The dispute with the former originated in his publishing, four years ago, what he denominated THE PROTESTANT'S CATECHISM; being an Episcopal Catechism, which, as the author observed in the work, "contains not one word about Almighty God or our Saviour Christ, nor indeed about any doctrinal or practical matter whatever, except that, "those who do not believe the worship of the Church of Rome to be idolatrous, are not Protestants,"* and that "Popery is *not to be tolerated*, either in public or in private."† It must be owned that the work is well calculated to produce the spirit of that intolerance, which it professes, together with its natural effects, on the minds of the unlettered populace; but, on the other hand, it teems with such whimsical paradoxes, such revolting falsehoods, and such glaring inconsistencies and contradictions, as cannot fail to cause the smile, if not the pity of men of judgment and learning. To instance a few of these: his Lordship maintains that Protestantism, which he defines to be: "The abjuration of Popery and the exclusion of Papists, from all power ecclesiastical or civil,"‡ is prior to Popery itself (that is to say, to a "subjection to the jurisdiction of the Pope,§ as he defines the latter), by *seven centuries*,"—this jurisdiction having been

* Prot. Catech. p. 46.

† Advertisement to ditto, p. 3, 54.

‡ Catech. p. 12.

§ P. 11.

granted (he says) to the Pope by the Emperor Phocas.* Hence it would follow that the Protestants abjured Popery and excluded Papists from all power six hundred years before either Popery or Papists existed. In like manner, his Lordship asserts, that "St. Paul established the Protestant Religion in Britain," because Theodoret, an author of the fifth century, says that this Apostle "brought salvation to the islands of the sea," meaning thereby Cyprus, Crete, Malta, and Sicily, (which islands, we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, he actually visited); and because Venantius, a poet of the sixth century, with "poetical license," as Bishop Godwin intimates,† sings that St. Paul "passed the ocean and every island that has a port, and all the land that the Briton and the utmost Thule (or Iceland) possesses."‡ In making this assertion his Lordship contradicts, as the author has shown, his own favourite author, Giraldus Cambrensis, the records of his own see, and that of Llandaff, Nennius, Venerable Bede, the Saxon Chronicle, Malmsbury, Usher, Godwin, and every ancient writer of every nation who has treated of the matter, in order to deprive the Apostolic See of the merit of having effected the general conversion of our ancestors, by the missionaries of Pope Eleutherius. His Lordship labours to support his gross error by the circumstance of a difference in computing the time of Easter, which was found to exist between the British Bishops and the Missionaries of Pope Gregory, when they began the conversion of our English ancestors, at the end of the sixth century.§ But the author has proved that the British Church agreed with that of Rome, and the others in general, on this point, by the Bishops of London, York, &c. having concurred with the rest of the Bishops in subscribing the decrees of the Council of Arles, A. D. 315: which Council decided that the Roman computation should be followed, and by the letter of the Emperor Constantine, which testifies that the British Churches followed it in the fourth century. In fact they did not get wrong until after the Saxon invasion.|| Besides this, as his Lordship maintains "that the Church of Rome was founded by St. Paul,"¶ as well as the Church of Britain, was it not incumbent on him to account for this difference? or are we to suppose that St. Paul appointed one time for keeping Easter at Rome, and another time for keeping it in Britain? Again, since his

* Pp. 15, 16.—In a subsequent page, Dr. Burgess says, that "The Papal domination did not exist before the time of Hildebrand Clement VII. in the eleventh century. Now Phocas began his reign in 602; Hildebrand was chosen Pope in 1073, and Clement VII. in 1523! Who can account for such multiplied anachronisms?"

† The Conversion of Britain, p. 6.

‡ Prot. Catech. p. 19.

§ P. 24.

|| End of Controv. Address, xiv.

¶ P. 13.

Lordship decidedly approves of the computation of his countrymen of old, why does he not call upon their descendants, the people of his diocese in South-Wales, to keep the same at present? With equal inconsistency does the Prelate introduce Pope Gregory the great's legate, St. Austin, making overtures to the British Prelates "to acknowledge the former's spiritual authority ;"* after having said, a little before, that the same Pope "reprobated the supremacy as presumptuous, heretical, and anti-christian."† But that these Bishops did not deny the Pope's supremacy in general, though they refused to acknowledge his legate for their Bishop, nor indeed, any other fundamental doctrine of the Apostolic See, the author made evident by referring to the terms of union proposed to them by the legate St. Austin, one of which was that *THEY SHOULD assist him in his mission for converting the Pagan English.*‡ Finally, whereas his Lordship asserts, on the credit of his bare word, that these our English ancestors, after having been converted to Christianity by Roman Missionaries, did not acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman See, and dissented from its faith, in several articles, which he mentions; the author of *The End of Controversy* proves the contrary, by original and indisputable evidence.§

The author was long doubtful whether his Lordship would take public notice of his work, or not. At length a pamphlet appeared, under the title of *THREE WORDS on General Thornton's Speech* (consisting of nine octavo pages), and *ONE WORD on Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy* (consisting of fourteen such pages), BY THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S. On looking into this work the author naturally expected that his Lordship had said something of the arguments contained in the former, as to the necessity of discovering the right Rule of Faith, and the proofs that the Catholic Church is exclusively possessed of it, and as to the visible marks contained in the Creeds, of her being the true Church of Christ, as these points constitute the plan and substance of *The End of Religious Controversy*; but no such thing is so much as mentioned in the fourteen pages of *THE ONE WORD*. They barely repeat the unproved and unprovable assertion of *The Protestant's Catechism*, with the further gratuitous assertion that, "in the elaborate correspondence, (*in the End of Controversy*) though not without its interest of learning and research, there is nothing material advanced in defence of Popery, to which the reader will not find

* End of Controversy, p. 24.

† P. 16.

‡ Address, p. xvii. Bed. Eccl. Hist. L. xi. c. 2.

§ P. 23, &c.

an answer in Bishop Bull's *Letter to Bossuet, and Smith's Errors* :* and that "the thirty-six pages addressed to the author of *The Protestant's Catechism*, afford no answer to that Catechism."† As the author was employed in giving a second edition of his *End of Controversy*, when the Bishop's pamphlet made its appearance, he added to it a POSTSCRIPT of considerable length,‡ in which he demonstrated that Bull and Smith had not answered his work before it was written, and that he himself had, in his *Address to the Bishop*, completely exposed and refuted his Lordship's paradoxical Chatechism, in all its parts. But as it would be tedious to go over again the ground which we have respectively trodden, I here conclude.

I remain, &c.

J. M., D. D.

LETTER IV.

The Bishop of St. David's Grand Schism of the Sixteenth Century.

DEAR SIR :—While the author was engaged in the above-mentioned POSTSCRIPT, he met with an advertisement in a periodical paper, announcing the speedy publication of THE GRAND SCHISM OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, BY THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S ; and though he could not form an idea of the materials of which his Lordship intended to compose this GRAND SCHISM, yet having had experience of his NO-POPERY zeal, and his passion for paradoxes, he ventured to predict that "the further his Lordship advanced in the thorny and miry lane in which he chose to walk, the more he would get entangled with contradictions, and the deeper he would sink in absurdity."§ After a long delay, during which the author was continually inquiring among the booksellers for THE GRAND SCHISM, the work under this title appeared, and the Right Rev. author of it does the present writer the honour of testifying, in his Preface, that "the impatience of Dr. Milner for the publication of THE GRAND SCHISM, had its due weight, in accelerating its appearance from the press ; for which (his Lordship adds) I thank him, as it leaves me more at liberty for other duties."|| But

* One Word, p. 14.

† Ibid, p. 15.

‡ Second Edition of The End of Controversy.

§ Postscript, p. 20.

|| Grand Schism, Advertisement, p. 11.

never was the author more disappointed, than he was upon a slight survey of the materials of the work. Of paradoxes, indeed, there was more than the Bishop's usual number; but as to the Schism, he could scarcely find the subject mentioned. In short it is a motley medley of four parts; the first part consists of a very weak vindication of Archbishop Wake from the charges of the Lutheran historian Mosheim, and Dr. Blackburn, author of the *CONFESSIO*NAL; the second part consists of objections to the Rev. Mr. Wix's proposal of holding a council of Catholics and Protestants, for reconciling their religious differences; the third part consists of his Lordship's defence of the Bible Societies, against the arguments of the Rev. Mr. Phelan; and the last part of an ineffectual attempt to disengage the Prelate's paradoxes in his *Protestant's Catechism*, and *One Word*, from the absurdities and contradictions which the author has attached to them.

To say nothing, at present, on the three first-mentioned subjects, the Right Rev. Prelate, treating of his controversy with the present author, takes no more notice, than he had done in his preceding work, of the main subject of *THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY*, namely, the demonstration of two distinct ways, *The Right Rule of Faith*, and *The True Church*, one or other of which is absolutely necessary for attaining to this most important END. Instead of this, he contents himself with repeating his refuted stories of St. Paul's having established a Protestant Church in Britain,* at a time when its inhabitants were the same Pagan Barbarians they are described to have been by Cæsar and Tacitus; of the pretended rejection of the Pope's authority by the British Bishops in the seventh century, at the very Council, in which they were pressed by his legate to *join him in converting the English*; of their acknowledged temporary error, in computing the pascal solemnity; of their *imaginary* aversion to pious images; of their *pretended vernacular versions* of the Scriptures. In this slight and fictitious manner does the Right Rev. Dr. Burgess endeavour to persuade those who wish to be deceived, that the British and Saxon Christians of this island were Protestants down to the Norman Conquest.† From that period he is willing to allow that the Church of England "was more or less subject to the jurisdiction of the Pope, down to the beginning of the sixteenth century;"‡ pretending at the same time, by fictions still grosser than the former, to trace the steps by which this jurisdiction was obtained. "From William the First (he says) the Pope obtained the privilege of sending legates." Were not then Fu-

* Grand Schism, p. 2. † P. 3. ‡ P. 3.

gatus and Duvionus, by whom the British Church was really founded in the second century, legates from Pope Eleutherius, if we may believe Usher among other historians? * Were not St. Germanus and Lupus legates from Pope Celestine (who also sent S. S. Paladius and Patrick, the former to convert the Scots, the latter the Irish), to extirpate the Pelagian heresy in Britain? † And does not the Bishop's favourite author Giraldus Cambrensis derive the Metropolitcal dignity of his see of St. David's from the authority of the former of these legates, in his (Giraldus) conference with Pope Lucius? ‡ "From Henry I. (says Dr. Burgess) the Pope obtained the donation and investiture of Bishoprics; from Stephen, the appellat jurisdiction; from Henry II., the exemption of Clerical persons from Lay power." § By way of bringing these points to a speedy issue, I would ask his Lordship: Does not Diceto, and other ancient writers contained in *Anglia Sacra*; does not the modern Richardson, in his notes on Godwin *De Præulibus*, show that each of our Primates received his investiture, that is, his jurisdiction, immediately from the Pope? Was not the right of appeal to Rome from all other churches confirmed by the council of Sardica, at which our British Prelates were present? || And did not S. Wilfred, of York, exercise this right of appeal to Rome, against Theodore, A. B., of Canterbury? ¶ With respect to Clerical immunities, every child knows that the object of Henry II., in his contest with S. Thomas à Becket, was to abolish these, not to establish them. The Prelate goes on to state, that Henry VIII. abolished the Pope's jurisdiction, but "left the doctrine and usages of the Church unreformed until the accession of Edward VI. It was then (adds the Prelate, but how falsely has been proved) and in the reign of Elizabeth, that the ancient faith and worship of the primitive Church were restored. But the Roman Catholics continued to frequent the Church of England, and to join in its services till the year 1580, when Parsons the Jesuit, and his associate missionaries, entirely put a stop to their conformity. THIS WAS THE GREAT SCHISM of the sixteenth century; the real separation between the two Churches, not of the Church of England from that of Rome, but of the Roman Catholics from the Church of England." ***

Here, then, Dear Sir, we hear the great secret concerning

* Antiquitates Eccl. Brit. ad. An. 176.

† Prosper in Chronic. Usher Annal. A.D. 429.

‡ Ex. Antiq. Registr. Landas, *Anglia Sacra*, P. ii. p. 669.

§ Grand Schism, p. 3.

|| St. Athan. in Apol. 3.

¶ Bed. Eccl. Hist. l. v. c. 2.

** P. 4.

THE GRAND SCHISM *of the sixteenth century*, disclosed, which, without the Bishop's information, no human being could ever have found out! This GRAND SCHISM, which is the professed subject of the Bishop's last publication, consisted in nothing more than in the practice of a few nameless Catholics, who, to save themselves from the fines, imprisonment, and other penalties of Elizabeth's persecuting reign, practised *occasional conformity*,* as many Dissenters have always done, and as many Churchmen have also done when the reigning power stood against them. In fact, if the Catholics were schismatics, for not conforming to the religion of the State, confirmed by Parliament in the reigns of Edward, Elizabeth, and James I., then the Episcopal Churchmen, who stood out against Presbyterianism and the Directory, being the Religion of the State in the succeeding reign, were Schismatics; then also Protestants of all sorts were Schismatics who refused obedience to the Catholic Religion and government in Mary's reign. Finally, then, both Catholics and Protestants were Schismatics in her father, Henry's reign; the former for withstanding the Act of Supremacy, the latter for withstanding that of the Six Articles!

The author will not follow His Lordship further in his perplexed and miry road, but will meet him at the termination of it. The Bishop acquaints Lord Kenyon and the public, at the CONCLUSION of his letter, that "the Church of Rome considers all Churches which are not in communion with her, that is, not under the jurisdiction of the Pope, and not professing the Articles of Pope Pius's Creed, as heretical and null, as having no orders, no ministry, no sacraments.† The Bishops and Ministers, therefore, of such churches, and the congregations that communicate with them, the Church of Rome asserts, *are all involved in the damnable sin of sacrilege.*"‡ Now all this, Dear Sir, is

* It is to be observed, that those Catholic conformists never had an idea of renouncing their own religion, by being present against their will, at the service of a different religion. So far from this, we are assured by Sande-rus, that they always took care to hear Mass at home, before they went to the parish church; and, what will appear extraordinary, the officiating clergyman on both occasions was frequently the self-same man: *De Schismate Anglic.*, p. 274. The unlawfulness and hypocrisy of the compliance in question was decided upon in a committee of the Council of Trent, and was strongly opposed and condemned in print by Cardinal Allen and other Catholic Divines, before Parsons became a Catholic.—Dodd's Ch. Hist. p. ii. p. 24, p. 44.

† For these assertions, Dr. Burgess quotes Ward, Challoner, and Gandolph; not one of whom says any such thing.

‡ The Prelate marks the words in Italics, as a quotation, but does not mention the author's name. He may be safely challenged to produce any Catholic writer, who expresses himself so loosely and inaccurately.

N.B. The Bishop of St. David's quotes Mr. Charles Butler's *Historical*

perfectly false, and implies gross ignorance of the theological matters treated of. Every Catholic knows that an individual, and even a whole Church, may be out of the communion of his Church, and not even profess Pope Pius's Creed without being *heretical*; and that even an *heretical Church does not lose its Orders, its Ministry, or its Sacraments*, by losing the true faith. It is notorious that the Catholic Church acknowledges the Orders and all the Seven Sacraments of the Greeks, the Russians, the Armenians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Cophts, and the Abyssinians, as being no less valid than her own. Nor would she hesitate to acknowledge the Orders of the Church of England, could it be proved that the Apostate Friar Barlow, the alleged consecrator of A. B. Matthew Parker (by whom the other Protestant Bishops of Elizabeth's reign were ordained) had himself been consecrated for any one of the four sees which he successively held, and that the forms of consecration and ordination, which were used in the Established Church down to the Restoration (when they were altered in consequence of Erastus Senior, that is to say, the Rev. John Lewgar's objections to them) were valid. In vain, however, have all the existing Registers been searched for a record of that ordination; instead of which, he is recorded to have publicly preached what Cranmer, at the same period, subscribed with his name, viz. "that if the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church, did denominate any layman to be a bishop, he would be as good a bishop as himself, or the best in England."*

Notwithstanding the Bishop has not taken notice of the scope and substance of the author's work, in either of his publications against it, yet, as in both of them, he calls upon the author to pay attention to his main argument for proving Catholics to be idolators, His Lordship shall be here gratified. His words in the former of them, are these: "Admitting, for one moment, that such a miraculous change [Transubstantiation] took place, on our Saviour's uttering those words, does it follow that the repetition of Christ's words will now renew the miracle? That when the Priest says: *This is my body*, the bread is changed

Memoirs, Vol. I., as attributing the English Schism to the Pope, not to Henry VIII. See *Grand Schism*, p. 50. It is to be hoped that His Lordship has misunderstood the Councillor: at all events, as the latter's opinion is not of the smallest weight on theological subjects, the author leaves the matter in question to be settled between them.

* Collier's *Eccles. Hist.*, p. 11. p. 135. Cranmer's decision on this matter, and others connected with it, is more diffusive and express. Among other things, he asserts that Bishops, Parsons, &c., are only the King's officers for exercising his spiritual supremacy, and that "no solemnity, beyond his commission, is requisite to make them such."—Burnet's *Hist. Ref.*, Part I. Records B. III. Art. xxi.

into Christ's body?"* He adds, in his second publication : " Though Dr. Milner left my former objections to the doctrine of Transubstantiation unanswered, I again invite him to the inquiry, in the sincerest wish to investigate the truth, and solicit him to show upon what scriptural authority any one can believe that a Roman Priest possesses the miraculous power of converting a material substance into *an immaterial being*, &c. ; upon what principle he can evade the charge of Idolatry, in taking that for God which is not God?"†

In the first place, then, it is necessary to point out the Bishop's theological error, in supposing the body of Christ (into which the sacramental bread by the omnipotence of God, is converted) even since his resurrection, is *immaterial*, though indeed it is *immortal*, and *impassible*. Were it immaterial, our Saviour would not have said to his Apostles, when he last appeared to them : *See my hands and feet, that it is I myself: handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have.*‡ Secondly, the Bishop's argument against the power of the Priest to consecrate the Sacramental elements from the supposed *want of scriptural authority*, militates against his own system in various respects, but not against the Catholic system : but what *scriptural* authority has he himself to perform that consecration of the bread and wine (in whatever it may consist) which the Rubricks of the common Prayer-book enjoin, and to ordain other priests to perform the same : nay, what is more, in the very act of ordaining them, to address them in the words of Christ to his Apostles : *receive the Holy Ghost ; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained* !§ Again, what *Scriptural* authority has he for using leavened bread for his *Sacrament*, whereas it is clear that Christ made use of unleavened ?—But, thirdly, in case the Bishop had carefully perused the first part of the work he was animadverting upon, he would have seen it proved that there is a two-fold rule of Faith and Religion, the *written* and the *unwritten word of God*, and that the last mentioned was, by the confession of all parties, the *original rule*. Hence he would have gathered that the essential forms and rites of the Great sacrifice of the New Law and of ordaining a succession of Priests to offer it up, together with the nature and object of it, were not *framed from the New Testament, but existed previously to it*. Yes, Mass was said before St. Matthew wrote his

* One Word, p. 22.

† Grand Schism, p. 55.

‡ Luke, xxiv. 39.

§ See the form of ordering Priests, according to the Church of England.

Gospel.* He would have seen, also, the necessity and the existence of a living speaking authority to preserve and interpret both parts of this rule; which authority resides exclusively in the Catholic Church, and pronounces, among other things, that when Christ, after having, himself, consecrated bread and wine into his body and blood at the last supper, said to his Apostles: *Do this for a commemoration of me,*† he commissioned them to do the same.‡

The author having proved himself to have duly considered the Bishop of St. David's grand argument for proving, as he fancied, the Catholic Church to be idolatrous; an argument, [which it must never be forgotten, was first suggested by *the Father of lies* to Luther§] he may reasonably hope that, if these pages should meet his Lordship's eye, he will particularly attend to the arguments contained in the First Part of THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, which demonstrate the existence and the necessity of an *unwritten* as well as of a *written* Rule of Faith as also of a *living speaking authority*, to interpret and enforce that rule, in the same manner as Judges and Magistrates are necessary in every civil society; and, in like manner, the proofs there adduced, of Christ's having appointed Oral Tradition and Church Authority, as the first and principal mean of propagating and preserving his revealed truths. These and the accompanying arguments being well weighed by his Lordship, in his present fixed determination of "dismissing every selfish interest, human respect, and prejudice, in the discussion of religious subjects, and of following truth whithersoever she may lead, with the utmost sincerity and ardour of his soul,"|| it may be confidently hoped that they will lead him, whither they have conducted and continue to conduct so many other wanderers, of the same upright dispositions, especially when on the brink of eternity, namely, to THE HOUSE OF PEACE AND UNITY, as it is called by St. Cyprian,¶ THE ONE FOLD OF THE ONE SHEPHERD, as our Blessed Saviour himself terms it.**

I am, yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* By way of illustrating this point, it may be remarked, that the most ancient Liturgies and Sacramentaries, no less than the Roman Missal, testify that Christ, immediately before he consecrated the bread, *lifted up his eyes to his Eternal Father*, an important circumstance, which is no where recorded in the Testament.

† Luke, xxii. 19.

‡ Concil. Trid. Sess. xxii. can. 2.

§ See Luther's long and argumentative conference with the devil, on a certain night, when the latter awakened him, in order to prove to him, that the Mass is idolatry. The conference was written by Luther himself, and published by his friend and disciple Melancthon.—See Opera Lutheri. Tom. vii. Edit. Wittenb. p. 228, &c.

|| One Word, p. 20.

¶ S. Cypr. de Unit. Eccl.

** John, x. 16.

POSTSCRIPT.

On Three Eminent Prelates of the Establishment.

The Right Rev. Dr. Burgess (as also the Rev. Mr. Grier) having frequently referred to the following Episcopal controvertists, B. Jewel, of Sarum, B. Taylor, of Down and Connor, and A. B. Wake, of Canterbury, in terms injurious to historical truth, as well as to the Catholic religion, the author thinks it right to place these characters in rather a different light from that in which those writers have exhibited them, that is to say, in their true light. The former writer, Dr. Burgess, speaking of the doctrine of the Church of England, says that "it must be collected from her Articles, Homilies, &c., and from that learned, venerated, and authorized organ of that Church, Bishop Jewel."* It is generally known that Jewel's chief opponent was Dr. Thomas Harding, who had been his intimate acquaintance, and fellow professor in the University of Oxford. When they came to write against each other, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, Jewel in his *Replie to Harding's Answere*, reproached him that, "not long si'thence he taught them, even in like sorte and in al respectes, as it is taught now." To this Harding answers in his *Rejoindre to M. Jewel's Replie*, "I am content, for truthes sake, freely to accuse myself. In certain points I was deceived, I confesse, by Calvine, Melancthon, and a fewe others, as you by them and sundry others are now deceived in many." Having said many things in extenuation of his conformity in Edward's reign, he proceeds thus: "But what meant you, M. Jewel, of al men, thus uncourteously, and withal, falsely, to deale with me?—For who be you, good Syr, that thus upbraide me with the reproach of inconstancie? Are not you one M. John Jewel, that in St. Marie's Church at Oxford, subscribed openly, before the whole Universitie, to the Articles, by the Catholiques maintained, by the Gospellers impugned, after the disputacions there kept against Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, whereat you were present and did the office of a Notarie; and, after that you had heared the uttermost, what could be said of your side, subscribed you not to these Articles, that Christe's true and natural body and blood are verily and really present in the sacrament of the aulter, that the Masse is a sacrifice propitiatory, &c.?" In the next leaf, Harding adds, still addressing Jewel: "How changeable your faith is according to the chaunge

* Grand Schism, p. 10.

of every Prince, to al them that ever knew you, it is not unknown. What King Henry would be chaunged, followed not you the same? Wherein he called backe with the lawe of the Sixe Articles, did you not retire, as it were, when his trumpet blew the retrait? In King Edward's daies, daunced you not after the pipe of that time? When Quene Marie came to the crowne, did you not frame yourself to be a conformable man to the Religion of that state, in every respecte, &c. ?* In the raigne of the Quene's Majesty that now is, have you not followed whatsoever chaunge is propounded? And yet did you not once confesse to mee plainly in Sarisburie, when you came thither in visitation, that you never liked the supremacie of temporal Princes over the Church of England? Did you not tell me that it stood neither with Scripture, nor with Doctours, nor with the judgment of the learned men of Germanie, Geneva, and the partes where you had bene?"

Having obtained promotion in Elizabeth's reign, one of his first acts was his famous challenge in a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross. In this, after enumerating twenty-seven of the chief points of controversy between the Catholics and the Protestants, he engaged himself to go over to the communion of the former. "If all the learned men, that be alive, be able to bring forth any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, in proof of them." With equal insincerity, or rather impudence, he exclaimed: "O Gregory! O Augustine! O Hierome! O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Paul! O Christ! if we be deceived you have deceived us:"† This implies that S. Gregory did not say Mass! that S. Augustine did not pray for the dead! that S. Jerome did not defend the invocation of saints, and the Pope's supremacy, &c. Such barefaced falsities, when thundered out by a Prelate in his lawn sleeves, might, indeed, be swallowed by a gaping crowd, in St. Paul's Church yard, but could not fail of exciting the disgust and indignation of men of learning of every religion. However, Jewel went on preaching and writing with the same unprincipled confidence, asserting what was clearly false, denying what was evidently true, misinterpreting, misquoting, clipping, enlarging and altering not only the writings of his opponents, but also those of the ancient Fathers and Doctors, to the number of hundreds and thousands of such frauds, as they have been reckoned up by Harding, Rostel, Walsingham, and others. It was not unusual with him to quote the words which S. Bonaventure, for example, Okeham, Cardinal

* Collier takes notice of Jewel's having penned the congratulatory Address of the University of Oxford to Mary on her accession to the Crown, Eccl. Hist. P. ii. p. 349.

† Printed Sermon, fol. 41, First and Second Answer to Dr. Cole,

Hosius, and other Doctors, had cited by way of objections to their opinions, and for the purpose of refuting them, as containing the doctrine of those Doctors themselves.* The detection of such frauds could not fail of producing several conversions to the Catholic faith, among persons of learning and sincerity. Hence Jewel's biographer and friend, Dr. Humphreys, admits that "he spoiled himself and his cause," by the boldness of his challenges; and the learned Anthony Wood, after quoting Godwin's panegyric upon him, gives a very long quotation from Parsons of a contrary tendency; to which he himself appears to give full credit. The following is an extract from it: "How many learned men of our nation have taken upon them seriously to go over that book of M. Jewel, and to examine it by the authors themselves, and have thereby been converted, for the most part, to the Catholic religion; of which sort I have heard relation of many, but of some I can testify myself, for that I have heard it from their own mouths. Omitting others, who for just respects may not be named, there was Sir Thomas Copley, made a Lord afterwards by the King of France, &c. The second example, which I remember of my own knowledge, is Dr. Stephens, a learned man, yet alive, who, being Secretary or Chaplain to Jewel, and a forward man in the Protestant Religion, espied certain false allegations in his master's book, whilst it was under the print in London, whereof advertising him by letter, the other commanded, notwithstanding, the print to go forward, &c. The third example was the celebrated W. Rainolds, who being an earnest professor and preacher of the Protestant Religion, fell to read over Mr. Jewel's book, and did translate some part of it into Latin; but before he had passed half over, he found such stuff, as made him gratefully mislike of the whole Religion; and so he, leaving his hopes and commodities in England, went over the sea, &c."†

It is not to be wondered at if such a time-server as Bishop Jewel was, should feel remorse at the approach of death, and wish to unsay a great many things he had published. Dr. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, formerly of Trinity College, Oxon, who was intimately acquainted with many of his friends, vindicating St. Augustine, our Apostle, whom Jewel had basely slandered as one "destitute of the Apostolic spirit,

* As an instance of this, it may be mentioned, that about the middle of his celebrated Apology, Jewel charges Cardinal Hosius with certain impious sentiments respecting the Holy Scriptures, together with many outcries against the Pope and the Catholics, whereas the Cardinal had barely cited those sentiments from the Lutheran fanatic Swenkfeld, by way of censuring them.

† Athenæ Oxon. vol. 1. N. 174. N. 273.

and unworthy to be called a Saint, but rather a hypocrite and superstitious, cruel and bloody man," on the pretended authority of Geoffry of Monmouth (who after all says no such thing) reports thus of Jewel: "A little before his death he charged his Chaplain, John Garbrand, to publish to the world that what he had written, he had done against his own knowledge and conscience, only to comply with the State, and that Religion which it had set up. And albeit, Garbrand did not, for fear, publish this so openly as he was charged, yet did he avouch it to many in Oxford."* The same Right Rev. Dr. Smith publishing a Latin folio, forty years later, in which he confirms the above account of Jewel's death-bed declaration, as appears below.†

The second eminent Bishop of the Established Church, whom Dr. Burgess extols, is Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down and Connor; "that great, that good, that pious Protestant Bishop," as his Lordship terms him.‡ He was at one time, namely, about 1638 (a time when several Dignitaries and Doctors of the Establishment became Catholic) in a ready way to be confirmed a member of the Church of Rome, as many of that persuasion have said; but, upon a Sermon delivered in St. Marie's Church in Oxon, Nov. 5, 1638, wherein several things were put in against the Papists, by the then Vice-Chancellor, he was rejected with scorn by those of that party, particularly by Fr. a S. Clara (*Father Davenport*), his intimate acquaintance; to whom afterwards he expressed some sorrow for those things that he had said against them, as the said S. Clara hath several times told me"§

The Episcopal Church being overturned and subjected to persecution by the Puritans, Dr. Taylor employed himself during his retirement in writing several of his works, the most cele-

* *The Prudential Ballance of Religion*, p. 53, published in 1609.

† "Atque hæc effrons Jewelli in S. Augustinum calumnia in memoriam mihi revocat detestabilem ejus morem, contra propriam conscientiam, impugnandi fidem Catholicam. Cum enim videret se moriturum, advocavit Capellanum suum Joannem Gerbrandum, etque præcepit, ut, quam primum animam efflasset, palam omnibus faceret, quod quicquid scripisset contra fidem Catholicam, id fecisset adversus veritatem ac suam conscientiam, duntaxat ut Elizabethæ Regina, placeret et Religionem illam fulciret quam ipsa introduxerat et quanquam Gerbrandus hoc omnibus palam non fecerit, pluribus tamen id retulit, ac, inter alios, Twino Doctori Medico Lewisiæ non ita pridem agenti, &c. Atque ego illud typis vulgavi, in *Prudentiali Bilanci*, ante annos 40, quando Twinus et ille viri Catholici in vivis erant, sine cujus-cunque, ad hunc usque diem redargutione. Imo Humfridus in *Vita Jewelli*, p. 101, indicat sparsum fuisse rumorem, quod in morte, retractata antiquâ fide, Papista evaserit, &c." *Florum Hist. Eccles. Gentis Angl. Libri Septem*. cap. xiii. p. 54. Parisiis, A. D. 1654.

‡ Grand Schism, p. 23.

§ Wood's *Athenæ*. Oxon, vol. 11. N. 273. *Liberty of Prophecyng*, Sect. xx. p. 250.

brated of which is his *Liberty of Prophecy*. In this he proves the justice of tolerating all Religions which are not injurious to the State, and employs a whole section about tolerating the Catholic Religion, in which, after setting forth many plausible arguments for its members believing it to be the true Religion, and after refuting different calumnious charges brought against it, he states the following, among other arguments in its favour: "The long continuance of its doctrines; that God could not, for so many ages, forsake his Church and leave her in error;—that whatever is new is not only suspicious, but also false, which (he says) are suppositions pious and plausible enough;—the beauty and splendour of their Church;—their pompous service;—the stateliness and solemnity of the Hierarchy;—their name of CATHOLIC;—the antiquity of many of their doctrines;—the continual succession of their Bishops; their immediate derivation from the Apostles; their title to succeed St. Peter;—the multitude and variety of people which are of their persuasion;—apparent consent with Antiquity in many ceremonials which other Churches have rejected;—the great consent of one part with another, in that which most of them affirm to be *De Fide*;—the great differences which are commenced among their adversaries;—their happiness of being instruments in converting diverse nations;—the piety and austerity of their Religious Orders of men and women;—the single lives of their Priests, Bishops, &c.;—These things and many others (he says) may very easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their forefathers."

Treating afterwards of the alleged Idolatry of Catholics in adoring the B. Sacrament, he proves, at great length, that "The object of their adoration, that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts and purposes (by which, God principally, if not solely, takes estimate of human actions) in the B. Sacrament is *the only true and eternal God, hypostatically joined with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the Sacramental signs. And if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping bread, in this case, that they themselves profess it to be idolatry so to do; which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idolatrous, &c.*"* Such was the judgment of this eminent prelate, when discussing the Catholic controversy in the cool shade of retirement, and when he himself was, to a certain degree, a fellow sufferer with the Catholics from Puritan fanaticism. Hence, of course, the Catholics have

* *Liberty of Proph.*, Sect. xx. p. 258.

a right to avail themselves of these important concessions, not only for the character of the writer who makes them, but also, and still more, for the evident truth which they flash on the mind of every instructed person who reads or hears them. But when Dr. Taylor's cause became again uppermost, and he was appointed to a Bishopric in Ireland, his language, if not his judgment, was found to be changed, as appears by the extracts of his *Gunpowder Sermon*, and his *Dissuasive from Popery*, which the Bishop of St. David's and Mr. Grier has made known to the author. The Bishop then found it expedient to preach and write against the pretended Superstitions and Idolatry of the Papists, with all the acrimony and vehemence of his predecessor in that career, B. Jewel, but with the same insincerity. It requires very little reflection to satisfy an intelligent and candid mind, in which of the situations above described Dr. Taylor spoke and wrote the genuine sentiments of his soul! But how does he himself account for the manifest contradiction between his *Liberty of Prophecy* and his *Dissuasive from Popery*? Does he gravely tell us that, by more intense study, since his promotion to a Bishopric, he had discovered that the Doctrines of the Church of Rome are *not* "of long continuance?" That there is *not* "a continual succession of her Bishops," nor an "immediate derivation from the Apostles?"—That there is *not* "great consent of one part with another and great differences among her adversaries?"—That she has *not* been "instrumental in converting diverse nations?"—Finally, that there are *not* "diverse things, which may easily persuade persons of much reason and more piety to retain the Religion of their forefathers?" On the other hand, has the expert logician (as Chillingworth attempted to do with respect to the motives of his conversion) has he answered his own arguments, in proof that *Catholics are not Idolaters*? Nothing of the sort. What expedient then does he adopt, to save his own character, as a Bishop, for consistency and truth, and that of the Church to which he belongs? Let us hear his own words, as they are quoted, though at greater length, by Dr. Burgess: "It was unkindly done—that they (*the Catholics*) should take the arms I had lent them for their defence, and throw them at my head. But the best of it is—the weapons themselves are but *wooden daggers*, &c. And, though what I said was but *tinsel* and *pretence*, *imagery*, and *whipped cream*, yet I could not be blamed to use no better than the best their cause could bear."* Such is Bishop Taylor's own excuse for the glaring inconsistency of his public doctrine! And now it may be asked, if the Prelate's worst enemy could represent

* *Dissuasive from Popery*, quoted by Dr. Burgess, *Grand Schism*, p. 14.

him in a more despicable or a more criminal character than he represents himself? In fact, does he not here exhibit himself, when treating of the gravest of all subjects, as a harlequin on a stage, brandishing a *wooden dagger*, amusing the populace with glittering *tinsel*, *pretence* and *imagery*, and feeding them with the froth of *whipped cream*? But this is not all, for when the nature and consequences of these mountebank tricks are considered, which are nothing less than to reconcile the consciences of both Catholics and Protestants to "*the damnable sin of idolatry*," as in the latter instance he calls it, we clearly see that the "wooden daggers" are in reality *mortal weapons*, and that "the whipped cream" is, in fact, *a deadly poison*. Such is "that great, that good, that pious Protestant Bishop,"* whom, together with Archbishop Wake, His Lordship of St. David's points out as "the illustrious Pillars of Protestantism and true Religion."†

The third of the eminent Prelates in question, is that "pillar of Protestantism" just mentioned, William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Burgess spends above a dozen pages of the Preface to his *Grand Schism* in vindicating this Primate from the charge brought against him by Archdeacon Blackburn, in his *Confessional*, and by Mosheim in his *History*, of being engaged with Dr. Dupin, of the Sorbonne, in negotiating a Religious Union between the Catholic Church of France and the Protestant Church of England. Without entering into their respective controversies, the present writer admits, for his part, that few Protestant Polemics have written with more acrimony against the Catholic Religion, and the Chief Pastor of it, than Wake has done. There is no need of turning over the folio volumes of *The Preservative against Popery*, which contains several of his treatises, breathing this spirit, to be convinced of it, as his *Brief Commentary on the Church Catechism*, which is in general circulation, abundantly proves it. In this he teaches his pupils that "The Church of Rome is both **SCHISMATICAL** and *heretical*, as professing such doctrines as **DESTROY the foundation of Christianity** :‡ (he had just before taught that heretics and schismatics are not members of the Catholic Church ;) that she is guilty of "the grossest idolatry that, may be, was ever committed in the world, by the honor she pays to the B. Virgin Mary."§ He says much the same respecting her veneration of the Saints :|| nay, he accuses her of having "other Gods besides the Lord ;"¶ and of the *idola-*

* Dissuasive from Popery, quoted by Dr. Burgess, *Grand Schism*, p. 23.

† Ibid. p. 25.

‡ Sect. xvi. 12.

§ Sect. x. 14.

|| Sect. xix. 8.

¶ Sect. xxiii. 15.

try of giving divine worship to a piece of bread.”* Such was his doctrine when Bishop of Lincoln, and such is his doctrine still, in his standing work the *Commentary*. But, being raised to the Primacy, and becoming infinitely desirous of effecting a coalition between the Anglican and the Gallican Churches, he softened his former rigid tone of controversy, and actually gave up several of his ancient and most cherished tenets. Dr. Burgess says, that it was not the Primate, but Dr. Dupin, who commenced the negotiation.†—Be it so.—He likewise says, in the words of Mosheim’s Translator, Maclaine, that “Dr. Wake seems to have aimed principally at bringing about a separation between the Gallican Church and the Court of Rome.”‡—Let that be so likewise.—He might have added, from the correspondence of the parties, published by Maclaine, that the Archbishop was offended with the dictatorial style of Dupin, in his *Commonitorium*, containing a plan of the intended union, and that *at first* he refused to yield any point to him.§ But what did he not, in the end, agree to? I mean in his last letter to Dr. Dupin, dated May 1, 1719 (which letter did not arrive at Paris till after the Doctor’s death.) The following is a faithful translation of his words out of the Latin original: “In doctrinal points, as they are candidly proposed by you, we do not differ much; in the mode of ecclesiastical government still less; in fundamental articles, whether of doctrine or of discipline, hardly at all.”|| This leads us to look back to some of the matters contained in the Doctor’s *Commonitorium*, consisting of his review of the Thirty-nine Articles: the substance of which review is given by Maclaine. Dupin then insists on the acknowledgment of a *middle state, or a purgation for certain souls after death,—also of the seven sacraments,—also of a real change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which body and blood are truly and really received by all,—also of an indifference, as to receiving under one or both kinds,—also of the sacrifice of the Mass,—also of a primacy, and limited power in certain cases of the Pope throughout the whole Church.*¶

Indeed, A. B. Wake, of his own accord, had agreed before to give up the *Primacy among Christian Bishops to the Roman Pontiff*.** Such are the terms on which this illustrious pillar of Protestantism expressed himself, in his last letter to the Sorbonne Doctor, willing to coalesce with the Catholic

* Sect. L. 4.

† Gr. Sch. Pref. p. 13.

‡ Ibid xvii.

§ Maclaine’s Third Append. to Mosheim’s Hist. N. iii. p. 96. Voi. vi.

|| Ibid. N. xv. p. 121. Vol. vi.

¶ Append. p. 78, &c.

** “Suo fruatur qualicunque Primatu: non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invideo.” Append. p. 106.

Church of France. Nor was the peace to have been merely a treaty of mutual forbearance, for the Archbishop proposed that the two churches should "agree to own each other to be true brethren and members of the Catholic Christian Church; to consent to communicate in every thing (he says) we can with one another, which on their side (that of the Catholics, he says) is very easy, there being nothing in our offices in any degree, contrary to their own principles, and would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in public service with them, and yet *leave one another in the free liberty of believing in Transubstantiation or not*, so long as we did not require any thing to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion. The Lutherans do this very thing: many of them communicate, not only in prayers, but *the communion*, with us; and we never inquire whether they believe *Consubstantiation*, or even *pay any worship to Christ, as present with the elements*, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions."*

The author would now ask any candid Protestant reader, or the Bishop of St. David's himself, whether, after weighing A. B. Wakes' above quoted concessions and proposals, he seriously thinks that *the Primate really believed the Catholics with whom he was treating to be those schismatics and heretics, those grossest of all idolators that ever were in the world*; and, in particular, that *the tenet of Transubstantiation and the worship of Christ in the B. Sacrament, is the sin of Idolatry*, as he teaches in his Catechism? Most certainly not. In like manner, if I were to ask such serious Protestants, or Dr. Burgess himself, whether he believes that Bishop Taylor was playing the mountebank, and intentionally deceiving the people in his celebrated *Liberty of Prophecy*, and that Bishop Jewel was more deservyng of credit, when he was paying court to the ruling power, as he always did throughout his life, or when he was preparing, on a death-bed, to meet his awful judge? I am sure he would answer me: NO.

* Letter XII. To the Rev. Mr. Beauvoir, chaplain to the English Embassy at Paris. He was the chief negociator between Wake and Dupin. Appendix, p. 118.

LETTER V.

The Controversy with the Rev. Richard Grier, A. M., &c.

PREFATORY REMARKS.

DEAR SIR:—I have now to vindicate THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY from an assailant of a different character, from the Bishop of St. David's; I mean THE REV. RICHARD GRIER, A. M., VICAR OF TEMPLE BODANE, AND CHAPLAIN TO EARL TALBOT, LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND, who has published, what he calls, A REPLY to that work. The Bishop, as if conscious of inspiration, or infallibility, delivers his dogmatical and historical decisions, not only without evidence, but very often in direct opposition to it: whereas the Vicar, though he too, not unfrequently, makes unsupported and false assertions, especially in commendation of his performance and his party, builds chiefly on his talent at misstating and misrepresenting the state of the question in hand, and the arguments of his opponents; and, when these are too clear to be obscured, or too stubborn to be tampered with, he directs the attention of his reader to quite different subjects, thus endeavouring to perplex and confuse his mind when he cannot convince it. He speaks plain enough when he courts his Noble Patron, the Home Secretary of State, "as the individual pointed out more than another, for his devotion to religion, his character, his talent, integrity, &c.,"* as likewise when he compliments the bench of Rt. Rev. Bishops. Nor is he less explicit, when, in judging another, he *condemns himself*;† by charging the present writer with those fraudulent practices of "perverting passages from their meaning, of misquoting, garbling, &c.," of which, it will soon appear, that he is so deeply guilty. It is only when he argues on points of controversy that he adopts the logical artifices above-mentioned, which he sometimes complicates to that degree, as to become absolutely unintelligible.

The Vicar copies the Bishop in adopting, for his motto, the impudent and self-refuted boast of Jortin; namely, that the Catholic Religion of all ages is, "a baffled system, which no author ever attacked without giving it a *mortal wound*;" for, if this were true, how many thousands of mortal wounds would it not have received at the hands of its enemies during the eighteen

* Dedication to Lord Viscount Sidmouth.

† Rom., I. i. 1.

centuries of its existence, from *Hymeneus and Alexander*,* down to Martin Luther, and from Martin Luther down to the Rev. Richard Grier: and yet it survives, *immortal and unchanged*,† to his acknowledged terror, while the respective systems of all its enemies have either disappeared, or shifted their ground by the general disbelief of their original creeds.

The Rev. Gentleman begins his desultory chapter of PREFATORY REMARKS, with expressing some fear as to the final issue of the combat; he is pleased to engage in this fear, however he attributes to "the versatility and long practice of his opponent,"‡ not to the advantage of the latter's cause. He next objects to the title of THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY; but upon no better ground than his own word, in a load of false and contumelious assertions and epithets, he heaps on it and its author, who, he says, "exceeds, in virulence against our Prelacy, Chaloner, Walmesley, Hawarden, &c." intimating that, the end the author had in view in composing "his precious Digest,"§ as he calls it, was to attack the present Prelacy. In the mean time, my real motive for publishing the work, and giving it the title it bears, appears on the face and throughout the whole body of it; namely, to furnish a rule or method for terminating all Religious Controversies whatever, which rule is the same that was ordained by Christ, and followed by the Apostles, the Fathers, and the Doctors of the Church for this purpose, in all ages, and which is analogous with that ordained in this and in every other civilized country for putting an end to civil disturbances and dissensions.

The Vicar is pleased to distinguish my "specious, sophistical language and polished style" from, what he calls, "the coarse and ribaldrous trash of Gregory Martin's *Discoverie*, and Ward's *Errata*,"|| the former of whom he accuses of "recommending assassination," and the latter of "fomenting treason:" and he allows that "such diabolical arts are not attributable to me;"¶ but then he asks, "how can he (the present writer) be

* 1 Tim. i. 20.

† See Dryden's *Hind and Panther*, a new edition of which has lately been published by Keating and Brown.

‡ Pref. Rem., p. 1.

§ Ibid, p. 111.

|| The superiority of these polemics, in point of argument, over their opponents Fulk and the Vicar, is evident to every reader; while their style, in point of civility, is at least on a level with that of the last named.

¶ On the authority of Foulis (that foulest of slanderers) the Vicar accuses the learned Martin of exhorting the women of the court, in a treatise on Schism, to murder Elizabeth. Camden, whom he also quotes to the same effect, barely says, that the *suspicion* of this treatise fell upon Martin, while Anthony Wood shows that Martin had been dead full two years before its appearance. The indefatigable Dodd clears up the business by proving

answerable for the effects which a work, under the magic of his name, will have produced among every class of the Popish community? thereby signifying that the *magic* of the writer's name leads to murder and treason.* To this foul insinuation the writer will content himself with saying, that, if his publications and his conduct are allowed to have been strictly moral and loyal, the *magic of his name*, if there is any magic in it, cannot fail of promoting those virtues instead of eradicating them. To be brief: no one, before the Vicar, has accused those exemplary Catholic Divines' names above of *virulency* against any one; and if there be any thing of that nature in my writings, with respect to two or three living Prelates, it consists barely in quoting some virulent expressions of theirs, against the Church to which they are indebted for all their wealth and honours.

As I do not intend, my Dear Sir, to enter upon any political disquisition respecting the Emancipation, with its congenial subjects, I shall satisfy myself with noticing, in the briefest manner, a few of the Vicar's more prominent blunders and mistakes in the ten pages he has thrown away upon it. I never then, Dear Sir, betrayed such ignorance, as to assert that "Civil disability and persecution are *convertible terms*,"† or that "Persecution enforces the *adoption of a particular creed*,"‡ Nor will any person, of common information, admit that "Transubstantiation is the touchstone of Popery,"§ knowing, as he must do, that the Greek and all the Eastern churches hold Transubstantiation, and yet reject the authority of the Pope. Much less will any such person believe that the Pope ever did or ever will "*Sanction the English Liturgy* (however he might allow of the *English Language* and *Communion in both kinds*,) provided the Legislature would acknowledge his Supremacy."|| Having mis-spent two more pages¶ in an attempt to

that different treatises of Schism appeared about the time in question, and that no one word of the alleged tendency is to be found in that of Martin. As to Thomas Martin, he was certainly a hearty Jacobite, as most of the respectable men in the nation, both of the Clergy and the Laity, were, during the reign of King William. There is no proof, however, that he was engaged in any conspiracy against the prince, nor is he charged with any in the passage the Vicar refers to. — *Preserv. against Pop.*, Vol. iii. Tit. ix. p. 38. * P. 5. † P. 8. ‡ P. 9. § P. 10.

¶ The Vicar makes this bold assertion, which implies that the Pope offered, and is still disposed to offer, the renunciation of *defined articles of Catholic Faith*; but without referring to any authority for it, and on the mere strength of his own credit. His subsequent blunders, about the *Veto*, the *Theological Judgment*, &c. are too numerous to be even recapitulated. One of these blunders, however, which affects the author's character, he is bound pointedly to repel. In the *Theological Judgment*, he, the author, indeed, denied that it is lawful to *swear that the deposing doctrine is DAMNABLE and HERETICAL* (which would be to frame a *new heresy*,) hence the Vicar concludes, with his usual inaccuracy, that the writer *recognizes* the doctrine relative to the *deposition of Princes*, p. 12. ¶ P. 14. p. 15.

reconcile his friends and neighbours in Ireland to the Lectures he has been reading them on their alleged disloyalty, and the necessity there is of keeping them chained down with disabilities and penal laws (not without "hazarding a word of his own advice to them—to abjure the Pope's Supremacy,") he abruptly flies off to the *Notes* of the Rhemish Testament. These he affirms, "every true Roman Catholic regards as of equal authority with the text!"* It might be expected, from a writer who has published so much against the Catholic Religion, that he would have acquired some information concerning its tenets; which is more easy to do, as our Creed, the Canons and Declarations of our Councils, and our authorized expositions, are in every library. But it does not suit the purpose of polemics, who are bent on finding her wrong, to consult those authorities; and, therefore, they frame doctrines and creeds for her. To be brief, what the Vicar affirms, namely, that, "every true Roman Catholic regards the Notes of the Rhemish Testament as of equal authority with the text,"† is a downright falsehood. The notes are of just the same authority as the annotators and the authors they quote, respectively are, and no more. The foundation of the Vicar's inferences from the Notes in question being thus destroyed, it is not necessary to say any thing of the Notes themselves. Thus much, however, I will say, that those inferences are no less false than they are malicious. For example, the first note which he professes to quote from the *Rhemish Testament* (but which, in fact, is in the *Douay Bible*) does not, even remotely intimate, that "Church guides ought to punish with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions."‡ These annotators knew full well, that Church guides are not allowed by the Church to take an active part in the capital punishment of the most atrocious criminals. It is in consequence of this law, that the Bishop's quit their seats whenever a prosecution of that tendency is brought into the Upper House of Parliament. The Vicar proceeds through more than six pages of misrepresentation and calumny,§ to blow the embers of persecution against the Catholics, and especially the Jesuits,||

* P. 15. † P. 16. ‡ P. 18. § From p. 16 to p. 22.

|| It is the glory of those learned and pious men that their worst enemies have, in all places and all times, been the chief enemies of the Christian Religion, or at least of the Catholic Church. At present, many of those enemies are forced, by political circumstances, to protect and encourage them. That any of the British Catholic Clergy have made the vows of the order in question, or of the Benedictian, Dominican, or Franciscan order, is merely a matter of surmise; such vows being of the most private, and of a mere conscientious nature. In the mean time, every well informed person must laugh at the absurd anecdote, which the Vicar pretends to quote from a late speech of the Bishop of Chester, namely, that "several Jesuits

into a flame, under the mask of preventing persecution : falsely asserting, at the same time, that he "has only followed whither Dr. Milner led him."*

Our Rev. Vicar next professes to vindicate his own Church from "the extravagancies of Luther and Zuinglius, the blasphemies of Paine, and the impious reveries of Joanna Southcote," which he pretends I have objected against her.† Paine's blasphemies I have not so much as mentioned in my work ; and if I have referred to the still more horrible blasphemies of the enthusiastic female, it was not by way of reproaching the Church of England with *admitting* them, but merely to prove the defectiveness of her Rule, that of private interpretation of Scripture, which prevented her from shaking off from her such gangrened members. In fact, Joanna Southcote always professed herself to be a strict member of the Established Church ; as such she appealed to the Bishops for their approbation of her spirit, and she glorified in having twelve of its officiating ministers for the *stars of her crown*, one of whom, a dignitary of a noble family, was in the habit of writing and sealing her passports to paradise:‡ and yet no means were adopted, that I could hear of, for restraining either the prophetess or her secretary from deluding the myriads of church-going people whom she led to their perdition, because from the nature of its Rule, the Established Church was possessed of no such means.

The case is, however, different with respect to Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, and Cranmer : they were the Fathers and Founders of the different sects of the Reformation, so called in their respective countries ; of course their extravagancies, impieties, immoralities, mutual excommunications, and persecutions, even to the extremity of death, affect not only the credit, but also *the truth* of their respective Religions. The Vicar indeed, admits, that "the Venerable Fathers of the Reformation (in England) held erroneous opinions upon doctrinal points, and betrayed an intolerance of spirit."§ "But," he adds, "they were candid enough to retract their errors."|| This is the Vicar's customary

had lately arrived from Liege, and held an ordination of their order *sub titulo paupertatis*." p. 21. Every such person knows that the establishment at Liege was finally broken up, and its members dispersed, by the greatest of all their enemies, the French Jacobins, in 1794 ; and that it is no more in the power of Jesuits to hold an ordination under any title whatever, than it is for them to hold a Session of Parliament.

* P. 20.

† P. 22.

‡ The writer is possessed of one of these passports, signed with three seals, one of which shows the morning star for our Saviour Christ, the other the evening star for Joanna Southcote, who has countersigned it in her own hand-writing.

§ P. 24.

|| Ibid.

practice : when it is utterly out of his power to evade or distort an assertion or a fact, he advances another of an opposite tendency on his own bare credit : for where does he find that any of those *Venerable* Fathers retracted his erroneous opinions, except indeed Cranmer, who, to save his life, signed six different forms of recanting the whole system of Protestantcy, which he had framed, under Edward VI., and this within the same number of weeks.* But “why,” he says, “reproach the Church of England with its earliest frailties—let it be viewed in its present matured state,” &c.† He then pronounces a lofty panegyric in its praise, the purport of which is easily discerned.

Having granted that the Church, to which he looks up, has “thrown open the door to sectarianism, though he, for his own part, shuts it against the numerous class belonging to the Evangelical Preachers (or Evangelical *Praters*, as he elsewhere calls them,) with their very numerous and respectable adherents,‡ he proceeds, by way of a set-off against the Catholic Church, to state, what he calls, “the greater, and more violent divisions and dissensions, which have prevailed in it, and continue to distract it, as likewise the schisms which arose in it,”§ in which he asserts on the authority of *Panvini*, in his *Chronicon*, “there were no less than *thirty-two* usurping and schismatical Popes.” He goes on : “Can Dr. M. overlook all these well-attested facts? Has the seventy years’ residence of the Pope at Avignon, &c. escaped Dr. M.’s recollection? Does he forget the schism of fifty years? But when we read not only of Anti-Popes, but Anti-Cardinals,” &c.—It is, indeed, my dear Sir, a most heartless task to be obliged to argue with an opponent, whose ideas are so confused, and whose information is so limited, as are those of the Vicar on the questions he asks. In fact, they are of the same predicament with the well known question among logicians : “An chimæra bombinans in vacuo posset edere secundas intentiones?” For example, he here distinguishes between the Franciscans and the Scotists, who form the same school, as do likewise the Dominicans and the Thomists, whom he equally divides, in the meantime both of them are strictly united together in faith and communion. On the other hand he exhibits the society of Jesuits as, singly, opposed to the Jansenists ; whereas the whole Catholic Church anathematizes the latter as heretics. The twenty-six schisms, improperly so called, with the thirty-two schismatical Popes, for the existence of which he quotes *Panvini*, would be seen, for the most part, not to have been schisms and schismatics, if he had not unfaith-

* Strype’s Mem. Eccl., Vol. III. p. 234.

‡ P. 25.

† Pref. Rem. p. 24.

§ P. 26.

fully suppressed that author's reflection upon them;* and the few real schisms would have been seen to exist, not *within* but *without the Catholic Church* (because the instant any one became a schismatic, in the same he ceased to be a member of the Catholic Church.) With respect to the Pope's place of residence, the Vicar has to learn that whether he is in the Vatican, or at Avignon, whether in the dungeons of Valence, or the fortress of Savona, he is equally *Bishop of Rome* and *Head of the Church*. Even in the Great Western Schism, this point was mutually agreed upon between the parties; and the only question was, which of the rival Popes was canonically elected. This *Principle of Unity*, could not fail to bring about Unity itself, while the divisions among the Protestants, for the want of this principle, are endless and incurable.

Amidst the confusion of his desperate and varied assaults on the Unity of the Catholic Church, the Vicar finds time to renew his vile, *refuted* charge against my fidelity as an historian. In doing this, he is conscious of *deliberate falsehood*, because he refers to my unanswered and *unanswerable* vindication of myself on the subject in question, contained in the work† he professes to reply to. In vain does he endeavour to confuse the question at issue, which lies within a very narrow compass, and may be settled in two minutes, by any person who has an opportunity of consulting my *History of Winchester*. The charge against my fidelity was first made by Dr. O'Connor, in his *Columbanus*; was thence copied by Mr. Le Mesurier, in his *Bampton Lectures*; and was, last of all, taken up by Mr. Grier, in his *Answer to Ward's Errata*. It stands thus: "That Dr. M., in the above-mentioned History, quotes Gildas for the exploits of King Arthur, who never once mentions his name!" It is needless to quote the abuse and ridicule the above-mentioned and other writers have poured upon me in consequence of this groundless charge. The truth is, *I have not*, in the pas-

* Onuphrius Panvinus, at the end of his *Chronicon* subjoined to Platina's *Lives of the Popes*, and twice quoted by the Vicar, makes the following "*Annotatio*" on his list of the schisms: "Enumerat D. Onuphrius schismata aliquot in Romana Ecclesia circa quæ notandum est, pleraque eorum tantum fuisse controversias et dissidia de Romano Pontifice, inter electores aut electos, quæ non nisi *improprie* schismata dici possunt. Quando autem, secundum ecclesiasticam phrasim, fuit veri nominis schisma, propter Pontificatum, ut in Novitiano, hoc *non fuit schisma in Ecclesia*; sed ab eo *qui extra ecclesiam erat*, contra Caput Ecclesiæ. Unde et hîc est improprietas sermonis dum tale schisma ponitur in R. Ecclesia." Onuphrius Panvinus in *calce Chronicon*, p. 73. Colon. A. D. 1626. What excuse, now, can our Vicar make for suppressing this important annotation of his author, and thus essentially altering his sense and meaning? Is not this a fraudulent garbelling of the worst description?

† End of Controv. Address, p. v. Prefat. Rem. p. xxx.

sage referred to, nor any where else, *quoted Gildas for the exploits of Arthur*; but *William of Malmesbury*; the only fact for which I quoted Gildas, was the year in which the battle of *Mons Badonicus*, or Bath, was fought, in which battle, I had learnt from Nennius, the other most celebrated British historian, that Arthur distinguished himself.* These particulars will appear on consulting *The History of Winchester*, vol. i. p. 61; taking care, at the same time, to observe the references and the notes in the passage. It is probable that Dr. O'Connor barely blundered, by not attending to these particulars, and that Mr. Le Mesurier, and also Mr. Grier, when he wrote against Ward, barely copied the Doctor. But it is impossible to excuse Mr. Grier from the *guilt of a known calumny*, in publishing his late *Reply*, as he therein refers to the demonstrative refutation of it, without so much as attempting to vindicate it.

The Vicar advances another false charge against the writer, when he says: "The Episcopal Clergy are, in general, objects of Dr. M.'s severest attacks, &c." So far from this being true, I have expressly testified, in the words of Dryden, my preference of the Religion of the Established Church of England to that of every other Protestant communion whatever. But then, if some of its clergy, or even of its dignitaries, should misrepresent and vilify the Church to which I belong, and to which they themselves are indebted for all their honours and comforts in this life and all their hopes for the next, am I not as free to vindicate her against them, as against any other men? Does not the Vicar himself oppose his opinion to the joint authority of the Bishops of Winchester and Peterborough, on the question of the three heavenly witnesses, 1 John, v. 7? And does not he even venture to dissent from the Bishop of St. David's, respecting the present plan of the Bible Society?† Why then may not I complain of this Prelate's proposal of repealing the elective franchise, granted them in Ireland, near thirty years ago, and instead of it proposing legislative measures for preventing the exercise of the Catholic Religion *in private*, no less than in public, which evidently cannot be done, without all the sanguinary detail of Elizabeth's persecution?‡ With respect to my laughing at His Lordship's historical and theological paradoxes, I own I have no excuse to make, except that I had not sufficient command of muscle to treat them gravely.

My adversary next charges me with the address of "bring-

* Hist. Brit. c. lxiii. Nennius reports that in this battle Arthur killed eight hundred Saxons with his own hand.

† See the Bishop's *Grand Schism*, p. 39, and the Vicar's *Reply*, p. 398.

‡ Protest. Catech. p. 53. and Advert. p. 3.

ing forward some of the ablest writers of the Church of England in controversion of their own principles.”* This, I suppose, is what he meant when he charged me with “perverting passages from their original meaning, misquoting, garbling extracts, &c.” The fact, however is, that throughout his whole book, he has not shown, nor can he show, I have been guilty in the slightest degree of any one of these frauds. True, it is, I have sometimes availed myself of the concessions of distinguished Protestant writers (as is the general practice of controversialists and pleaders, with respect to their opponents,) but not so as to bind myself to admit their opinions or sentiments on other subjects, or such as they may have advanced at other times or in different circumstances. If, indeed, I were convicted of suppressing any exceptions or limitation or explanation of any author in a passage I had quoted from him, as the Vicar has just now been, in the case of Panvini, I should hang my head with conscious shame before the learned world: but this I never have done, and it will be seen, in the course of the present work, that each attempt of the writer to bring me in guilty of this charge, is completely frustrated. But, on the other hand, if some Protestant writers are inconsistent with themselves, as I shall prove to be the case with Chillingworth, and if others vary their doctrine, according to the changes of their situation, or of the objects they have in view, as I have shown above to have been the case with Bishop Taylor and Archbishop Wake, it is not my business, nor is it in my power, to reconcile their contradictions; neither do their assertions or denials, at one time, invalidate their opposite declarations at another, any more than when the same thing happens with respect to prisoners at the bar.

Having so fully discussed, in the POSTSCRIPT to my last letter, the questions relative to the above-named Prelates, I have nothing more to add on this head, except to point out the Vicar’s falsification of my quotation from A. B. Wake’s Letter to Dr. Dupin, and of my reasoning upon it. My quotation from the letter was precisely what follows. Speaking of the Pope, the Archbishop says: “suo gaudeat qualicunque Primatu” (*let him enjoy his Primacy, whatever it is.*) My inference, thence, was this: “The late Archbishop Wake, after all his bitter writings against the Pope and the Catholic Church, coming to discuss the terms of a proposed Union between this Church and the Church of England, expressed himself willing to allow a certain superiority to the Roman Pontiff.”† And certainly a great concession it was for a writer, who had always before

* P. xxxii.

† End of Controv., Let. xlv., p. 143.

held up the Pope to his people as a heretic and schismatic, the head of an idolatrous, blasphemous society, and the very Anti-Christ, to be willing to acknowledge him as a Christian Bishop, and even the Primate among Christian Bishops. But observe, dear Sir, that I never “declared that this *certain superiority* was *Supreme authority*,” or that “the Archbishop conceded the point of Papal supremacy :” * this is a falsification of the Vicar’s fabrication. Hence, of course, his long quotations from Wake’s letters, to prove that he did not concede *Supreme authority* to the Pope, are nothing more than dust thrown into the eyes of ignorant or superficial readers. What aggravates the Vicar’s fraud, is that, in the very act of falsifying his opponent’s text, he charges him with “wilful misrepresentation.” † The Vicar admits that “Dr. M— is warranted in some one or two instances, as in the case of Thorndyke and Montague, in what he says,” namely, in quoting them to prove that Catholics are not Idolaters; after which admission the Vicar pours out the full torrent of his own and Stillingfleet’s invective against these eminent Protestant controversialists, the former a Prebendary of Westminster, the latter a Bishop of Norwich. I do not, however, claim their testimony farther than they fairly give it after a full investigation of the question; and by the same rule I claim the support of the eminent Bishops, Pearson, Bramhall, Laud, Sheldon, Blandford, &c., as likewise of Chillingworth, Hooker, and other Protestant writers, to the extent of my citing them, but no further. The Vicar next takes up the controversy between Bishop Burgess and Bishop Marsh, concerning the word *Cepha*, *πτερος* or *Rock*, but without throwing one ray of light upon it, or lending his ally of St. David’s the slightest help towards extricating him from the thorns in which he has entangled himself, much less does he disprove the claims of St. Peter’s See, grounded on the text in question. Mat. xvi. 18.

I will not here dispute with the Vicar concerning the respective names of Catholics and Protestants: he may, if he pleases, derive the word *Pope* from *Popa a Butcher*, rather than from *Papa a Father*; and he may date Bishop Jewel’s works against the Catholics, before he himself became a Protestant, ‡ for any thing that concerns the present controversy. He may likewise

* P. 35.

† P. 36.

‡ The Vicar says, that “Jewel called the Catholics *Papists* and *Romanists*, long before pains and penalties were enacted against them.” Now by the first Act of Elizabeth’s reign, and also by different Acts of Henry, the penalties of High Treason were enacted against Catholics; and many of them, besides Sir Thomas More, suffered death in virtue of them, at a time when Jewel himself was a Catholic.

"protest against Dr. Milner's arrogant assumption of the term *Catholic*,"* as exclusively belonging to the Catholic Church : his protest can no more deprive her of this title, in the general acceptation of mankind, than the prerogatives implied by it. I will even wager with him, that if I were to send a letter, through the Protestant Post-Office, directed to *The Rev. CATHOLIC Rector of Templebodane*, it would never reach *The Rev. Richard Grier, A. M.*

The remainder of the Vicar's *Prefatory Remarks*, consists of hollow professions and empty boasting. He apologizes for being "too minute and diffuse in referring to the ancient Fathers:"† which he says has been "owing to his determination to deprive Dr. M. of the adventitious aid which he derived from this source." Now, it will be found, on examination, that he does not notice one-quarter of the ancient ecclesiastical authorities that I appeal to, and that those which he has noticed he had better have left alone. He says that he has "considered it indispensable to quote the authors in their own words."‡ This he has done or omitted to do, as best suited his purpose. He says, that "truth has been his sole object, his honest and honourable end."§—The falsehood of this declaration appears glaring in the paragraph that immediately follows it, where he asserts that he has "noticed all Dr. M.'s principal arguments:"|| whereas, it is clear that he has entirely overlooked almost all Dr. M.'s arguments of that description, and has slipped aside from those which he could not help meeting. The Vicar adds that, "however some persons (meaning the Bishop of St. David's) may think that the single objection to Popery arising from its Idolatry is in ONE WORD, an answer to the whole "of Dr. M.'s *End of Religious Controversy*," he himself is of a different opinion from his Lordship,¶ and therefore he publishes his present REPLY." Now it is my firm opinion, dear Sir, which I am convinced will be confirmed by that of the Vicar's Noble Patrons, when they come to review the whole course of the controversy, that the Rev. Richard Grier would have consulted the credit and interest of the cause he has undertaken, much better by confining himself to some ONE WORD concerning the alleged Idolatry of the Catholic Religion, or any other he might single out after the example of the Prelate, than by publishing such a mass of erroneous and ill-reasoned matter against it as he has done, while he leaves his own Religion open to the thrusts of his adversary at every stroke he aims. The Vicar's argument for the cause he follows, is of a piece with the rest of his reasoning. "I have to observe (he says) that it is an incontro-

* P. 42. † P. 43. ‡ P. 43. § P. 44. || Ibid. ¶ P. 45.

vertible proof of the soundness of our cause, that the arguments of our ablest Divines can bear to be brought forward again and again."* Just so, might any of the empyrics, who fill our Newspapers with advertisements of their remedies for all sorts of distempers, publish : *It is an incontrovertible proof of the efficacy of my remedy, that it will bear to be advertized again and again!*

The Rev. Vicar concludes his REMARKS with a specimen of that *temperate* style which he professed to adopt in his DEDICATION to Lord Sidmouth, where he charges his adversaries, alluding to the present writer in particular, with "levity, fallacy, folly, and forgetfulness of the humiliating defeats which (he says) Popery has sustained, in all its forms, since the Reformation, and with courting fresh disasters and multiplied disgrace." In the same style he adds, "while the champions of our church, from the time of Jewel to the present day, have been uniformly triumphant, their opponents only live in the praises of such men as Gregory Martin, Thomas Ward, and THE REV. DOCTOR MILNER.†

In answer to this empty gasconade, an equal to which it will be difficult to find, I shall content myself with referring to yourself, Dear Sir, and the other respectable converts of both sexes, in each of the four Districts of England, as living proofs that THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY is not quite so *light* and *foolish* as the Vicar represents it to be ; having been the instrument, in the hand of God, of opening their eyes to the truth of his holy Religion ; and, it may be reasonably expected, that such A REPLY to it as the Rev. Richard Grier has put forth, especially when recommended to public notice by such high patronage as it has met with, will increase the number of Catholic converts.

I am, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER VI.

Canon of the Scriptures, &c.

DEAR SIR :—You have witnessed the discomfiture of The Rev. Mr. Grier, in each of his desultory charges upon THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, you will now see what success attends his main attack upon it.

* P. 45.

† P. xlvii.

He begins with alluding to my proofs of the necessity of an unwritten as well as a written Rule of Faith; and of a living speaking authority in the Church of Christ, for preserving, defining, and interpreting them both, in the same manner as there is a similar necessity in every civil state and regulated society;* but, instead of contesting these, my primary and fundamental principles, he undertakes to answer an incidental question of secondary importance, which I asked, concerning the Canon of Scripture. I might grant the Rev. Vicar all that he has laboured to prove throughout his four first chapters, constituting more than a quarter part of his whole work, namely, those concerning the Canon of Scripture, and the fidelity of the English Translation of the Bible, without weakening my arguments respecting the Rule of Faith, and the necessity of a living expositor of it, which, through God's grace, Dear Sir, have been so mainly efficacious in your happy conversion. However, as my antagonist declines meeting me in the open field, I must follow him into the by-lanes in which he chooses to skirmish.

After enlarging on the above-mentioned topics, I exposed the inconsistency of most Protestants who take their English Bible in hand with the same confidence as if they had immediately received it, as Moses received the Tables of the Commandments, from God himself, on Mount Sinai:† whereas, I observed that satisfactory answers to several previous questions are necessary to justify a reflecting Protestant, in such confidence in his Bible. For by what means (said I, addressing some one of them) have you learnt what is the Canon of Scripture, that is to say, which are the books, written by Divine Inspiration? or, indeed, that any books at all have been so written? Again, admitting them to have been written by the Prophets and Apostles, how do you prove that these wrote under the influence of inspiration? Besides two of the Evangelists, S. S. Mark and Luke, were not Apostles at all, and probably not Christians, till Christ withdrew from the earth. Again, supposing the Divine authority of the sacred books to be established, since the originals have long since been lost, how do you prove that the copies of them from which your Bible is printed, were genuine and pure, as likewise that they have been faithfully translated? But in particular, and above all, what security have you that you understand those mysterious books, or indeed any part of them, in their true sense; that is to say, when you reject the other part of the Rule of Faith, Tradition, together with

* See The End of Religious Controversy, Part i. Letters v, vi, vii, &c.

† See The End of Religious Controversy, Part I. Letter ix. p. 67.

the authority of the Church ?”* On two of these questions, and on two of them alone, the Vicar takes me up, under the following titles : *The Scriptural Canon of the Church of England vindicated, and Our Authorized Translation of the Bible Vindicated.*

Undertaking to answer me on the former point, the Vicar says : “ Our Saviour said that the Law, and the Prophets, and the Psalms testified of him, and his words are true. Thus then the Scriptures themselves, the *written word*, tell me where the Canon of Scripture is to be found. Those I believe while I reject Tradition, which Dr. M. receives with sentiments of equal piety and reverence ; nay, as even possessing *superior* authority to the Scriptures themselves.”† I am bound, in the first place, to demolish the Vicar’s groundless fabrication of my attributing to *Tradition*, authority *superior* to that of the *Scriptures themselves* ; I never was so inconsistent or so impious : as, in fact, I always knew that every word of the Eternal Truth, whether written or unwritten, is of equal authority. In the next place, though I firmly believe what our Saviour said, namely, that *the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms bear testimony to him*, yet I would ask the Vicar : how does this text prove that *Ecclesiastes*, the *Song of Solomon*, the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, *Revelations*, and all the other books of Scripture, not here mentioned, form part of the Sacred Canon ? Lastly, whereas the Vicar builds the authority of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, on the Gospel of St. Luke,‡ I may ask him, on what authority (after rejecting Tradition) he builds that of St. Luke himself ? His theology is evidently of a piece with the philosophy of the Indians mentioned by Locke,§ who, undertaking to explain how the earth is supported, say that it rests upon a huge elephant, and that the elephant stands upon an enormous tortoise ; but are at a loss to say on what the tortoise itself stands.

However positive the Vicar was, at the beginning of his chapter, in resting the authority of Scripture upon Scripture itself ; yet, returning to the subject, he professes himself willing to admit a certain species of Tradition in support of Scripture, but this he calls *Tradition of Testimony*, in contradistinction to *Tradition of Faith* :|| just as if the Divine character of Scripture, the very point which this very tradition testifies, were not itself *an Article of Faith* ! and just as if that tradition, which required four hundred years to ascertain, concerning the num-

* P. 68, p. 74.

† Rev. Mr. Grier’s Reply, p. 2.

‡ Luke, xxiv. 44.

§ On the Human Understanding.

|| Reply, p. 3.

ber of the books of the New Testament, were of greater authority than the tradition, for example, respecting prayers for the dead, about which there never was any question or uncertainty in the Church at all, from the time of the Apostles down to that of the heretic Aërius! But common sense tells us that the credit of a witness, as far as regards his testimony, must stand or fall *in toto*. If tradition is to be rejected, when it affirms that Christ is corporally present in the Holy Communion, it is to be equally rejected when it assures me that the book of the Gospels, containing the same doctrine, is the word of God. How confused the Vicar's mind was upon the whole subject of his first chapter, appears by his interrupting it and returning to it again and again, and by his rash, inconsistent and contradictory assertions respecting it. These draw out his matter to a tedious length. But as my object is to comprize my refutation of his *Reply* in the narrowest compass possible, I shall follow the natural order of the subject, rather than his irregular method of treating it.

By way of showing that it is not precisely the character of an Apostle, which constitutes an Evangelist or Canonical writer, I mentioned that St. Mark and St. Luke were both Evangelists, though they were not Apostles, and probably not Christians, while Christ was here on earth: hence I concluded that it is in virtue of tradition that the Church has at all times received their respective Gospels as the Word of God. To this the Vicar answers: "We receive these Gospels, as we do ancient interpretations of them, by what, in a certain sense, may be called tradition; yet we do this *at our own discretion*."* This is as much as to say, that the Gospels are of no greater authority than the Commentaries of Theophylactus, and that Christians are free to reject them if they please. To expose such impious follies is to refute them. On the other hand, I showed that the Epistle of St. Barnabas, though written by one who is called in Scripture *an Apostle*, and described as doing the *work of an Apostle*, is not acknowledged by the Church to be part of Scripture, because it wants the testimony of Tradition to recommend it as such. This puts the Vicar on mis-spending half a dozen pages to prove this very point, namely, that it is not supported by tradition: thus confirming my argument instead of refuting it. I shall satisfy myself with mentioning several downright falsehoods of the Vicar, which occur in this his first chapter, as it would be a waste of time and paper to refute them separately. It is false, then, that "Our Saviour (in the text above cited) sanctioned the identical Canon of the old Testament, which the

* Reply, p. 11.

Church of England has adopted.”* It is false that “the concurrent voice of antiquity rejects those several books of the Old Scripture, received by the Catholic Church, which are not contained in the Hebrew Bible, and this by reason of their not being referred to by Christ.”† It is an accumulated and shameful falsity, that “Dr. M— contends that the Church of Rome is warranted in attempting to degrade that which was the only canon of our Saviour Christ, by calling it the CANON OF THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES.”‡ It is false that “Dr. M— has so much as spoken till now of the *Canon of the Scribes and Pharisees*.” Finally, it is false that “the Church of Rome ascribes *higher authority* to the Latin Vulgate than to the inspired originals.”§ This falsehood is the less excusable, as the Vicar proves, by quoting it, that he had the Decree of the Council of Trent on this head before him when he wrote, and, of course, that he saw the Council said not one word about the “*inspired originals*,” but barely declared which, among the existing *Latin editions* of the Sacred Books, was to be esteemed the authentic edition.|| The Vicar reproaches the Catholic Church with “*an egregious error*,” as he terms it, in the preference she gives to the Vulgate; though she assigns the most satisfactory of all reasons for so doing, namely, that it has been in use, and has been approved of during a long course of ages,¶ which implies that the Church has always had her eyes upon it, to prevent its corruption. This could not be affirmed of any other edition. The Vicar’s words are these: “This *living, speaking* authority (of the Catholic Church) was guilty of an egregious error, in the outset, in determining its Canon from an interpolated Greek Copy of the Bible, namely, the Septuagint.”*** It is to be observed, however, first, That the Vulgate Version was made, part of it from the Hebrew and part of it from the Greek Septuagint, in ages when the text of them both was far more pure than it was either in the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, when the present versions of the English were made; and this by persons infinitely better qualified for the task than were Tyndal, Coverdale, Parker, and their assistants;†† secondly, That the

* P. 5.

† P. 6.

‡ P. 9.

§ P. 10.

|| “*Sacro sancta Synodus, considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesie Dei, si, ex omnibus Latinis editionibus quæ circum feruntur Sacrorum Librorum, quæ nam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgaris editio—Pro authentica habeatur.*”—Con Trid. Sess. iv. De Can. Scrip.

¶ “*Vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu ipsa Ecclesia probata est.*”—*Ibid.*

** Reply, p. 6.

†† The learned Kennicot complains of the corrupt state of the Hebrew text in modern ages. The dispassionate Dr. Brett says: “Though the

Evangelists and St. Paul are accustomed, in their quotations of the Old Testament, to make use of the Greek Septuagint in preference to the Hebrew original;* and lastly, That the Vicar himself is reduced to fly from the Hebrew of the Old Testament to the Greek Septuagint, and from the original Greek Text of the New Testament to the Latin Vulgate, in certain instances of the last importance, as will shortly appear.

The Vicar shows himself particularly angry when the authority of eminent Protestant writers is brought against his system, as is the case in the present question. Accordingly he calls it "A novel course for a Popish polemic—and designed to confirm the bigotry of R. Catholic readers."†—He boasts, however, of having been almost "uniformly successful in detecting error or misrepresentation." It must be observed, by the way, that if the Vicar falls short of the writers alluded to in consistency and reasoning, he greatly surpasses them on this and many other occasions in confidence and self-commendation, the grounds for which you will not fail, Dear Sir, to observe. The proposition which the Vicar undertakes to combat, is the following one, contained in *The End of Controversy*: "Indeed, it is so clear that the Canon of Scripture is built on Tradition, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge, in terms almost as strong as those of the well-known declaration of St. Augustin. *Contra Epist. Fund.*‡ The Protestant authors referred to, in support of this assertion, are Luther in his *Commentary on John*, c. 16. Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Politie*, c. iii. sec. 8. and Lardner in B. Watson's *Collect.* vol. ii. p. 20.—With respect to the first-mentioned authority, Luther, the Vicar gives him up to me as an upholder of Tradition, when he asks: "What have the errors of Luther, this Apostate monk, to do with the question at issue?"§ I answer, a great deal, if Luther was a learned man, as he certainly was; and if he was a Protestant, or rather the father of Protestantism, which no one denies. In short, it completely justifies the assertion, which the Vicar undertakes to disprove.—

original is always to be preferred to the best translation, and therefore if we had the original Hebrew Text, as written by the inspired penmen, the matter would not bear a dispute; yet, as the authentic Original has been lost for many ages, and there are only copies of it in this original language, all which have suffered by the oversights, ignorance, or boldness of transcribers, an old translation may be of great use to settle the true reading, by informing us how the text stood in that old copy from which the translation was made." Dr. Brett's *Dissertation on the Ancient Version of the Bible*, in Bishop Watson's *Collection*. Vol. iii. p. 52.

* See Menochius's *Dissertations*; also Dr. Brett, who gives many instances of it; p. 44.

† Reply, p. 18.

‡ Let. ix. p. 68.

§ Reply, p. 19.

The second learned Protestant whom the Vicar professes to "detect Dr. M. misrepresenting and erroneously quoting," is the celebrated Hooker; in attempting which, he both misrepresents that author's argument, and misquotes his words. To be brief; Hooker lays it down as a principle that "the Scriptures are the oracles of God;" but he adds: "we cannot say that this; in itself, is evident;—there must be therefore some *former knowledge* presupposed. The question being by what means we are taught this: some answer, that to learn it, *we have no other way than only tradition.*—But is this enough? That, which all men's experience teacheth them, may not in any wise be denied. And, by experience, we all know that *the first outward motive*, leading men to esteem of the Scripture, is *the authority of God's church.*"* Hooker then goes on to show how a diligent study of the Scripture confirms the esteem of it, which he had acquired from the authority of the Church. On comparing the Vicar's account of this testimony, and his quotation from it, with the original text of it, as given above, it will be seen how grossly he misrepresents it and misquotes it, especially where he denies that Hooker himself admitted tradition to be "the former knowledge, by which we are taught that the Scriptures are the oracles of God," and where he changes the word MOTIVE into NOTICE, in order to make Hooker say that tradition barely *gives us NOTICE of such a thing as Scripture*, not that it is *the first outward motive* for believing in it.

The same practice of misrepresenting and falsifying his authorities accompanies the Vicar in his appeal to the text of Dr. Lardner. It is true I said that "the Canon of Holy Scripture was fixed by the tradition and authority of the Church, declared in the third Council of Carthage, and a Decretal of Pope Innocent I. It is likewise true that I said: "It is so true that the Canon of Scripture is built on the tradition of the Church, that most learned Protestants, with Luther himself, have been forced to acknowledge it," for which I quoted Hooker and Lardner as my authorities.† But, you will observe, Dear Sir, I never once intimated that either of those learned Protestants acknowledged the Canon to have been fixed by the above-mentioned Council and Pope. It was enough for my purpose, to show that they fixed it on *tradition*. That Lardner did so, no less than Hooker, is clear, by the very words which the Vicar quotes from him. "In fine, the Writings of the Apostles and the Evangelists are received as the works of other eminent men of antiquity, upon the ground of general consent and testimony."‡

* Eccles. Polit., l. iv. sect. viii. p. 103., edit. 1632.

† Letter IX., p. 69.

‡ Reply. p. 24.

This being so, I proceed to ask : What is *general consent and testimony*, with respect to the actions and writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, except the tradition of the Church? And how can this consent and testimony be so readily and satisfactorily obtained, as by Synods of the Bishops and Declarations of the Pontiffs? That the Bishop of Winchester agrees with me in sentiment, as far as regards synods, appears from his elements of Theology, where, in accounting for the uncertainty of the sacred Canon in the first ages of the Church, he says : "the persecutions under which the professors of Christianity laboured, and the want of a national establishment of Christianity, prevented, for many centuries, any general assembly of Christians for the purpose of settling the Canon of their Scriptures."* In opposition to my above statement, namely, that "the Canon of the Scripture was declared in the third Council of Carthage," the Vicar quotes Lardner as saying : "the third Council of Carthage ONLY ordains that nothing but Canonical Scripture be read in the Church, under the name of Canonical Scripture."† Take notice, Dear Sir, that the important word ONLY is foisted into the text of the author by the Vicar. Lardner does not make use of it.‡ But the intent of it is clearly seen, by the egregious falsity which follows it, where the Vicar says : "The Council does not pronounce what books were Canonical, and what not; although it appears that some were considered Canonical at that time."§ Whereas that Council does positively declare, in its 47th Canon, which are the *Canonical Scriptures*, under this very name, and enumerates them exactly as the Council of Trent has done, 1149 years since.||

It may be asked, why the Vicar has taken no notice of another learned Protestant writer who is referred to for the same purpose, in *The End of Controversy* ; I mean the famous Chillingworth?¶ The latter treats the subject as follows : "When Scripture is affirmed to be the rule by which all controversies of religion are to be decided, those are to be excepted out of the

* Vol. i. p. 11., c. 1. The Bishop, following the learned foreign Protestant Michaelis, says : "If the Church had not heard from the Apostles that the writings of Mark and Luke were Divine, these would not have been received." Thus Dr. Tomline and Michaelis, like all other sensible Christians, build the Canon of Scripture on tradition.

† Reply, p. 23.

‡ Watson's Collect., v. ii. p. 21.

§ Reply, p. 24.

|| Labbe's Councils. Tom. ii. p. 1177. Binius, Caranza, &c.—The Vicar introduces, p. 25, some irrelative jargon from Selden's *Table Talk*, written by one Richard Milward, a Puritanical retainer of his, about reconciling the Church with the private spirit. It is not more to the present purpose, than is Luther's *Table Talk* about *Incubi Devils*, &c re-published by that fanatical Parliament, of which Selden was a leading member.

¶ Letter ix. p. 68.

generality, which are concerning Scripture itself.”* He then proceeds to build Scripture, not indeed on the Tradition of the Church, but upon, what he calls, Universal Tradition ; though, in fact, there is no other tradition on the subject, except that of the Church. Among numberless other Protestant Authorities, of the first rank, which I might have adduced to the same effect, is that of “the illustrious pillar of Protestantcy,” as the Vicar’s ally, the Bishop of St. David’s, calls him. A. B. Wake, who, treating of the foundation of the Scriptures, in his *Commentary on the Church Catechism*, puts down the following questions and answers. *Question*. “How do you know what books were written by these persons (the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists?)—*Answer*. By the constant, universal testimony both of the Jewish and Christian Churches : from the former of which we have received the Scriptures of the Old, from the latter those of the New Testament. *Q*. What think you of the Tradition of the Church? *A*. Could I be sure that any thing, not contained in the Scriptures, came down by a certain uninterrupted Tradition from the Apostles, I should not except against it. Nay, *I do therefore receive the Holy Scriptures, as the Rule of my Faith, because they have such a tradition to warrant me so to do.*” If any further confirmation of my assertion, which the Vicar impugns, were wanting, namely, that *learned Protestants build their Canon of Scripture on the Tradition of the Church*, I need but quote the sixth, among the thirty-nine articles, which declares as follows : “In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the church.” Now, though the supposition here made is false, namely, that there never was any doubt in the Church concerning the authority of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the *Revelations*, and several other books enumerated in the Canon of the Established Church, yet it cannot be denied that she here acknowledges the continued reception of such and such books by the Church, that is to say by Tradition, as the proof of their canonicity.

Having thrown wide open the pretended *viscious circle* in which B. Porteus and certain other Protestants have endeavoured to enclose our Analysis of Faith, by showing that, though we argue from the testimony of the Church in proof of Scripture, and from that of Scripture, in favour of the Church, there is nothing irrational or inconclusive in our so doing, because we observe a certain due order in our argument, and consider the objects in different points of view ; the Vicar attempts, but in vain, to close it upon us. In a word : we believe the Church

* Religion of Protest.

to have been instituted by Christ, and to teach the true doctrine on the motives of credibility, recapitulated by S. Augustin, and quoted on the reverse of the title-page of the Second Part of *The End of Controversy*. On her testimony, among other truths, we believe that certain books called *The Scriptures*, contain the inspired Word of God. On looking into these, we find that some of the clearest and strongest passages in them, show the Church to be possessed of higher prerogatives than we had before attributed to her, namely, inerrancy, indefectibility, the continued presence of Christ with his Holy Spirit, &c. Of course we believe these testimonies, and our veneration for the Church greatly increases. "What fatuity," to use the Vicar's term,* or defective reasoning is there in this method? He says that, according to it, "the Church *decides infallibly* on the authority of the Scriptures, while their authority confirms *its infallibility*." No, Sir: I have expressly guarded against that cavil, by representing the Church as a *credible*, but not as an *infallible witness*, in the first instance. Her absolute *inerrancy* I learn from those Scriptures, which she has beforehand proved to me are divine. That two witnesses may, in some circumstances, bear mutual testimony to each other, I have proved by the example of St. John the Baptist and our Saviour. The Vicar denies the parity, but he shows himself unable to point out any *disparity*; and I illustrated the case by a more familiar example. I suppose a person, who proves himself, to my entire satisfaction, to have been sent to me by the King, delivers to me a letter from his Majesty containing these words: *The bearer of this is fully instructed as to our Royal will and sentiments: you will, therefore, pay the same respect to his declarations, as if they were delivered to you by ourself*; I ask, "Would there be any *fatuity*, in my reverencing and following the oral instructions of this Royal messenger, though it was on his credit I received the letter, as coming from the King?" The Vicar sneers at this illustration, because he cannot argue against it.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER VII.

Version of the English Bible.

DEAR SIR;—You have witnessed the failure of our Vicar in his attempt to vindicate the Canon of Scripture, without recourse to the authority of tradition, and this on Protestant, as well as

* Reply, p. 33.

on Catholic grounds. As to the other point, which he says he is equally called upon to prove, on the same condition of not recurring to tradition, namely: "which are the books, that have been written by *Divine Inspiration*, and, indeed, that any books at all have been so written,"* he entirely gives it up, in the following terms: "to pronounce with confidence what books of the Canon, or parts of books are inspired, and what not, may consistently belong to Dr. M., as being a member of a Church which lays claim to infallibility; but certainly not to a member of the Church of England. So that when he asks, how we have learned, *what books have been written by Divine Inspiration, or that any books at all have been so written?* we may answer that, where the Holy Scriptures declare that they set forth a Divine Revelation, or that they express the word of God, we believe them to do so: [*thus again grounding a thing to be proved upon itself?*] but as to the fact of their inspiration, we must, with awe and humility, decline to say, what we believe no Church, ancient or modern can attest."† If this were so, I would ask the Vicar, of what great use is the Scripture more than any other good book? and why is it called *the word of God*? Again, with what consistency does the Church of England appeal to it, in her articles, as her only Rule of Faith? But the Vicar's ideas, are evidently confused on the subject, and therefore he hastens to another more familiar to him, since he has already published a quarto volume upon the fidelity of the English Bible. However, as the fifty pages he spends upon it in the present work, consist for the most part, of mere declamation in praise of the translation, its authors, and himself, together with proportional abuse of its critics, and Dr. M. (a style in which I will not contend with the Rev. Gentleman), I hope to be able to confine my reflections within much narrower bounds than he confines his.

The Vicar begins his declamation, Dear Sir, with unlimited abuse of your correspondent. This he carries on through the greater part of ten pages, reproaching me with *ignorance, superciliousness, arrogance, superficialness, &c.*‡ In short, he says, that "Dr. M. cannot stand a competition, on the score of learning and talents, with even the obscurest" of the fifty-four Clergymen who were named in the reign of James I., to make a new version of the Scripture, though he confesses there are five amongst them of whom he knows nothing at all, and some others of whom he has barely learnt *something* from the late Mr. Todd.§ To this abuse I am content to answer, that as the Vicar knows nothing of me or my attainments, but what he

* Reply, p. 2.

† P. 9.

‡ P. 61, et seq.

§ P. 66.

learns from my publications, which, together with his own, are before the world, so our respective characters for learning and talents will not be decided upon by what we may say of ourselves, but by what others may judge of us.

The very profession of the Vicar, which is to vindicate at the same time Tyndal's translation of the Bible, and King James's correction of it, as being both of them faultless, carries with it its own refutation, and betrays his insincerity and spirit of chicanery. His fellow labourer, Dr. Ryan, whose *Analysis of Ward's Errata** he has commended, "as decisive to the extent it goes,"† very fairly gives up several corruptions of the sacred text, which disgraced Tindal's and the other early translations and editions of the English Bible, during more than fifty years, as indefensible. Thus, for example, speaking of Ward, he says: "He produces seven texts to show that we mistranslated our Bible, for the purpose of injuring his Church, and to excuse our apostacy from it: but the former mistranslations of these seven texts having been corrected in our present Bible, should have been excluded from his catalogue of errata."‡ With the same fairness Dr. Ryan says: "He (Ward) produces eight texts, which he accuses us of misconstruing against the Sacrament and Mass; but five of the eight having been corrected in our version, agreeably to his own, should have been excluded from the book."§ The Doctor proceeds, "Our opponent (Ward) charges us with misconstruing twelve texts, for the purpose of proving Catholics guilty of Idolatry." But six of the twelve being corrected in our Bible, ought to have been omitted "in his list."|| In a word, this advocate of the English Bible challenges the *Popish Doctors*, as he calls them, to answer him this question: "Did not the translators of our Bible of the year 1633, correct forty er-

* Dublin, 1808.

† Reply, p. 94.

‡ Analysis, p. 10. In Tyndal's translation and the editions of 1562, 1577, 1579, instead of the word **CHURCH**, the word **CONGREGATION** is used in the following manner: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my CONGREGATION*, Mat. xvi. 18. *If he will not hear them, tell the CONGREGATION*; and if he will not hear the CONGREGATION, let him be to thee as a heathen, &c. Mat. xviii. 17.

§ Ibid. p. 12. In two of these passages, Mat. xxvi. and Mark xiv. 22. instead of saying *Jesus blessed the Bread*, the old editions say: *HAVING GIVEN THANKS* in two other passages, 1. Cor. ix. 13., and 1 Cor. x. 18. the word **TEMPLE** is used, instead of **ALTAR**, to exclude the idea of a *Sacrifice*, under the new law.

|| Ibid. p. 24. The following are some of the old corruptions which have been since corrected, according to the original and the Rheims Testament, Coloss. iii. 5. *Covetousness, which is the worshipping of images*, Ephes. v. 5., 2 Cor. vi. 16. *How agreeth the Temple of God with Images?* 1 John, v. 21. *Babes, keep yourselves from Images.*

rors in our old ones?*" Such is the acknowledgment of Dr. Ryan, writing in defence of the English Bible, against the learned Cavalier Thomas Ward; but the Rev. Mr. Grier undertakes equally to vindicate the old version and the new one, the corrected and the uncorrected text; and even in those very passages in which the infidelity of the latter is most glaring, and obnoxious to the English Church, as well as to the Catholic Church. For example, he defends Tyndal and his followers in the use of the word *Congregation*, for that of *Church*, affirming that, in so doing, "they did not depart from the letter or the meaning of the Holy Ghost."† In a word, he pronounces with Selden's *Table-Talker*, that "the English translation of the Bible is the best in the world, and which renders the sense of the original the best; taking in for the English translation the *Bishops' Bible* as well as King James's;" adding: "The Bishops made the preceding English versions of Tyndal and Coverdale the models and as it were the basis of their own."‡ Thus then, according to the Vicar, the version of the Lutheran Tyndal from the Latin Vulgate, of the Calvinist Coverdale, from the Vulgate and the Greek,§ and the corrected Version of the English Divines from the Hebrew and the Greek, though often differing from each other in meaning, as well as in other respects, are each of them "*the best translation in the world, and renders the sense of the original the best.*"

The Vicar, as might be expected, speaks in high terms of Tyndal, whom John Fox calls *England's Apostle*, and with equal censure of his great antagonist Sir Thomas More. Had the Vicar read and faithfully exhibited the former's books, called, *The Wicked Mammon, The True Obedience, and The Answer to Syr T. More*, together with the latter's *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer, &c.*, I am convinced he must have lowered his tone of panegyric with respect to Tyndal into

* P. 62. To this the Catholic Doctors answer in the affirmative. But they add: first, that the very circumstance of their being corrected by Protestants, is a proof that the latter acknowledged them to be errors: secondly, that after the forty corrections in question have been made, a still greater number of corrections remain to be made.

† Answer to Ward's Errata by Rev. R. Grier, 1812, p. 2. To this, his former work, the Vicar refers in his present *Reply*, with his usual modesty, as follows: "I trust the readers of my *Answer* will credit the truth of the assertion, that my publication, comprising, as it does, the ablest arguments of our most learned divines, contains a full and victorious refutation of pernicious error; and that I have successfully established the superior merit of our standing English text, no less than its fidelity."—*Reply*, p. 94.

‡ P. 76.

§ Coverdale had the chief hand in the Genevan edition, which was so obnoxious to the Church of England, that the Prelates of the establishment constantly oppose its publication, as may be seen in Strype.

H

that of extenuation, at least, as he would have found this pretended Apostle's language to be no less seditious than it is heretodox, and no less injurious to the present Church of England, than it was to that of former times. With the most specious pretensions to charity and submission, he terms, at every turn, those who were most dignified and venerated in Church and State, "apish, pivish, popish jugglers, thieves, murderers, blood-suppers, Pilates, Herods, priapists, sodomites, hangmen, Christ-killers, devils, &c."* The learned and dignified author, quoted below, points out, "amonge other tokens of Tyndale's evill intent in hys translacion, for ensawmple, that he chaunged commonlye this woorde *Churche* into this woorde *Congregation*, and this woorde *Priest* into this woorde *Seniour*; and *Charitie* into *love*, and *grace* into *favour*, *confession* into *knowledge*, and *penaunce* and *repentance*, with wordes mo, which he chaunged and useth dayly, as in turning *ydoles* into *ymages*, and *anoynting* into *smering*, *consecrating* into *charming*, *sacramentes* into *ceremonys*, and *ceremonys* into *witchecraftes*, and yet many moe."† Notwithstanding John Fox attributes a splendid miracle (in rendering void the enchantment of a certain magician,) to the sanctity of Tyndal,‡ he is far from succeeding in vindicating his religious or his moral principies.§ It appears that, though Coverdale encouraged his disciple Frith to die for his belief, yet, it is plain, from his story, that he himself suffered death, not for that, or his English translation of the Bible, but for treasonable practices against the Government of the Low Countries under which he lived. But why does not the Vicar honour the name of the abovementioned Frith, who had so large a share in his Master Tindal's Bible, with a single notice? I can conceive no other motive for this, except that, when he was burnt, in Henry's reign, for denying the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament, Archbishop Cranmer had the chief hand in bringing him to the stake. The Vicar, however, makes amends for this omission, by the lofty praises he heaps on the "Venerable Coverdale," as he calls him, who was the most conspicuous character in giving the early editions of the English Bible: This Apostate Friar was of the same religious order with Luther, and, like him, broke through his solemn vow of continency, by taking to himself a pretended wife, during the con-

* Sir Thomas More's Works. London, 1517, p. 336.

† Syr T. More's Second Booke, whiche confuteth the Defence of Tyndall, for his Translacion, p. 405.

‡ See Acts and Moriani.

§ This appears by his attempt to get into Bishop Tunstal's service, after he had declared himself a Protestant, and by his constant maxim of, bearing with the times.

fusion of Edward's reign, at which time also he became Bishop of Exeter. Retiring to Geneva, when Mary mounted the throne, he sucked in there the doctrine and prejudices of Calvin, so that, returning to England, when Elizabeth became Queen, he was neither restored to his See, nor treated as a Bishop. It was not without difficulty that he obtained the poor living of St. Magnus,' near London Bridge, and he was, after some time, turned out of that for non-conformity. The Vicar sets up a most curious proof of the fidelity of Coverdale's Biblical Labours, which is worthy, Dear Sir, of your notice, as a specimen of the conclusiveness of his reasoning; it is this, Fulk declares as follows: "I myself did heare that Reverend Father, M. Dr. Coverdale, of holie and learned memorie, in a sermon at St. Paule's Crosse, upon occasion of some slaunderous reportes, that then were raised against his translation, declare his faithful purpose in doing the same, which, after it was finished and presented to K. Henry VIII., and by him committed to diverse Bishops of that time to *peruse*, of which, as I remember, *Stephen Gardiner* was one,—they being demanded by the King, *Are there any heresies maintained thereby?* They answered that there were no heresies that they could find maintained thereby."*—So far Fulk, to whose account of Coverdale's Sermon, the Vicar subjoins the following inference: "This single admission of Gardiner speaks volumes!" But, Dear Sir, I would ask the Reverend Gentleman the following questions: *Of what weight is William Fulke's account of Miles Coverdale's Sermon in defence of the old exploded version?* Secondly, *What signify Stephen Gardiner's words concerning it, or any other point during Henry's reign, when he was as abject a slave to the religious tyrant as Cranmer himself was?* Thirdly, *What proof of the fidelity of a Scriptural Translation would the decision even of a Council be, that it maintained no heresies; when it might be found censurable on twenty other theological charges?* And, what then becomes of the Reverend Vicar's *Volumes of evidence*, for the purity of Coverdale's version? But the simple fact of a new Translation of the whole Scripture having been set on foot and executed by authority both of Church and State, in James's reign, is a proof that the former version of Tyndal and Coverdale, even after it had been corrected by the Bishops, was deemed to be faulty. That it did abound with errors is demonstrated by the learned Gregory Martin, in his *Discoverie*, &c., whom Fulke in vain attempted to answer. The same is again demonstrated, together with sufficient proofs that the present version also abounds with errors,

* Reply, p. 73.

by the intelligent Thomas Ward, in his *Errata*, the success of whose undertaking accounts for the Vicar's unbounded abuse of him.* But what need is there of a further exposure of the latter's absurdity, in attempting to vindicate both the Old and the New Version, the uncorrected and the corrected one, and to prove that each of them is *The best translation in the world*, than the Vicar's subsequent comparison between them, and the preference which he gives, in an important instance, to the former?

Proceeding to treat of the new version of the Scriptures, which was made by order of King James I., more than seventy years after the first appearance of the former, the Vicar chiefly confines himself to combating the following passage in *The End of Controversy*, where, speaking of the Bibles, "which had been published by authority or generally used by Protestants in this country," the author said: "Those of Tyndal, Coverdale, and Queen Elizabeth's Bishops, were so notoriously corrupt, as to cause a general outcry against them among learned Protestants, as well as among Catholics, in which the King himself, James I., joined: and accordingly he ordered a new version of it to be made, being the same that is now in use, with some few alterations made in it after the Restoration."†

The Vicar commences his attack on this passage with denying, first, that learned divines of the *Church of England*, whom

* There is no expression of hatred and of contempt too strong for the Vicar, in speaking of these two able and learned men, which is the best proof of his being wounded by their pens, and of his inability to cope with them. The fellow students of Gregory Martin, at Oxford, bore a very different testimony of his learning and merit from that of Mr. Grier. The celebrated Historian of that University relates that, when the Duke of Norfolk, to whose eldest son Martin was then domestic tutor, visited St. John's College, he was greeted with a public oration, in which the orator, speaking of its great ornament, Gregory Martin, said,

"*Habes, illustrissime Dux, Hebræum nostrum, Græcum nostrum,*

"*Poetam nostrum, decus et gloriam nostram.*"—*Athen. Oxon. P. 1. N. 221.*

With respect to Ward, it may be enough to say that, though a layman and a military man, he proved himself to be an overmatch for his different clerical antagonists, one of whom was Ritchel, vicar of Hexam; another Tension, A. B., of Canterbury. See his *Monomachia*. His *Cantos on the Reformation*, though written in dogrel verse, contain such sterling matter, as to have caused the conversion of many Protestants, and among others of the late Rev. Roland Davies, C. A. D. The Vicar's pretended *Answer to the Errata*, was the prototype to his *Reply to the End of Controversy*. He writes much about different subjects, and about them, and makes many bold assertions and denials, but never once proves the point which he takes in hand to prove.

† Quoting that foolish book, *Selden's Table-Talk*, he says that, "The Bishop's Bible (the old translation, copied chiefly from Tyndal and Coverdale) ranks equally high, as a translation, with King James's, and either of them is the best translation in the world."—*Reply*, p. 76.

‡ End of Controversy, Lett. ix. p. 71.

alone he acknowledges to be Protestants, objected to the Old Version; and, secondly, that the Puritans to whom he refuses that title, raised any outcry against it. But I would ask him, whether the subscribers to the *Millenary Petition* to Parliament, who therein describe themselves to be "more than a thousand Ministers, that had subscribed the Service Book" of Common Prayer, and whose representatives, at the Conference of Hampton-Court, were Dr. Reynold and Dr. Spark, both of them Professors of Oxford University, were not Divines of the Church of England? And whether these representatives did not then and there petition as follows: "May it please your Majesty, that the Bible be new translated, such as are extant not answering the Original, which he (Dr. Reynold) instanced in three particulars."* Did not the Lincolnshire Ministers present a petition to the King in December, 1604, complaining that "the Book of Common Prayer appoints such a translation of Scripture to be used in the churches, as in some places is absurd, and in others, takes from, perverts, obscures and falsifies the word of God; examples of which are produced with the authorities of the most considerable Reformers."† Was not Broughton of Cambridge an Episcopal Protestant, and "the greatest scholar of his age for Hebrew," as Strype testifies? And yet he charged the Bible, authorised in his time (the Bishops' Bible) with "a great number of errors," which he called "traps and pitfalls;" adding, in his letter to the Lord Treasurer, that "sundry Lords, and some Bishops and others of inferior rank, had requested him to bestow his labour in clearing the Bible translations."‡ Finally, the Vicar himself quotes the Translators of the new Version as "echoing the words of the King," when they state that "upon the importunate petition of the Puritans," the Conference of Hampton-court was held, in which "they had recourse at last to this shift, that they could not with good conscience, subscribe to the Communion Book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was, as they

* These particulars are the following: 1st, Gal. iv. 25, *custodu* wrong translated *bordereth*. According to this, *Mount Sina* in Arabia, *borders* upon Jerusalem! 2dly, Ps. 105, 28. *They were not disobedient* (or they rebelled not), contradictorily translated, *They were not obedient*. 3dly, Ps. 106, 20. *Phineas executed judgment*, wrong translated, *Phineas prayed*. See Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. x. p. 14. The Vicar asserts that "the passages at first objected to (by the Non-conformists, and which he calls an *empty shift* and a *shallow pretence*), have continued in it (the existing version) *without alteration*." p. 81. Now the fact is, that each of them has been altered according to the suggestion of Dr. Reynolds and his party, as will be seen in the present English Bible.

† Neal's Hist. of Puritans, Vol. ii. p. 53.

‡ Strype's Life of A. B. Whitgift, p. 433 and 587.

said, *a most corrupt Translation.*”* I would now appeal to any candid reader, of whatever Religion he may be, no less than to yourself, whether I was not justified in stating, that “there was an outcry against those Bibles, (Tyndal’s, Coverdale’s, and the Bishop’s) among learned Protestants, as well as Catholics?” It remains to be seen whether “King James joined in it, or not?”

The Vicar is forced to acknowledge the truth of Fuller’s and Collier’s account of this business; who state, that on Dr. Reynolds’s petition being made, His Majesty answered, “I profess I could never yet see a Bible well translated in English: but I think that, of all, that of Geneva is the worst.”† This declaration the Vicar says, “can only be supposed to mean that *he never yet had seen an English Bible, in which there were not passages capable of being better translated!*”‡ His pretext for this perversion of language is, that when the King gave orders for the New Translation, which he represents him to have done merely to humour a poor empty shift, a mere shallow pretence§ of the Church of England’s enemies, he gave directions that “The Bishop’s Bible be followed, and as little altered as *the truth of the Original will permit;*” and that “Tyndal’s, &c. be used when they agree *better with the text,* than the Bishops.”|| And yet what else does this signify, except that the Bishops Bible is *not always conformable to the truth of the original?* and that *the other editions sometimes agree better with the text than does the Bishop’s?* Such is the Vicar’s ingenuity in refuting his own argument; after which exhibition, he concludes with his customary self-complacency, “I have thus disposed of the royal censure in all its bearings.”¶

The Vicar represents it to be a demonstrative proof of the different sects of Non-conformists and Dissenters subscribing to the purity and excellence of the present version, that they have never attempted to substitute another in its place: But, is this the fact? Did not *The Grand Committee for Religion*, in 1656, when the Presbyterians were in power, appoint a Subcommittee, “to confer with Dr. Walton and five others about another Translation of the Bible! and were not many meetings held on this subject at Secretary Whitlock’s house?”*** Again, at the Savoy Conference in 1661, did not the Non-conformist Divines object to a great number of faulty translations of scriptural passages which occurred in the liturgy, and obtain that they

* Reply, p. 80.

† Fuller, Eccl. Hist., B. x. p. 14.

‡ Ibid. p. 91.

§ P. 91.

¶ Collier’s Eccl. Hist. P. ii. p. 869.

§ Reply, p. 81.

¶ P. 92.

should be amended ?* I need say nothing by way of answer to the Vicar, in justification of Sir Thomas More's, Bishop Tunstall's and other Catholics' predictions, as to the consequences to be expected from the general diffusion of Tyndal's and the other Protestant Bibles without an expositor, or so much as a commentary or note upon them, since these were visibly fulfilled in the sacrilegious confusion of Edward's reign, and still more in the fanatic rebellion and regicide fury of that of Charles I., when not a folly or a crime took place without *chapter and verse* being quoted in its vindication. In short, the Established Church of England, with the Vicar himself, has at last taken just alarm at the consequences to be apprehended for herself, as well as for the State, from an unbounded and indiscriminate diffusion of Bibles, without the Prayer Book to direct its meaning. I do not find myself called upon to make any remark on the praises, which the twenty-two Protestant writers whom he quotes, bestow on their own Bible. The Vicar's citation of these twenty-two witnesses makes no more for his cause, than if I were to cite the two hundred and fifty-two Prelates of the Council of Trent who pronounced upon mine.

Speaking of the last English Translation of the Bible ; the one now in use, published by K. James I., in 1611, the author of *The End of Controversy* said, "Though these new translators have corrected many wilful errors of their predecessors, most of which are levelled at Catholic doctrines and discipline, yet they have left a sufficient number of these behind, for which I do not find that their advocates offer any excuse." Two of these he specified as standing in direct opposition to the Original text, as it is quoted by those advocates, Dr. Ryan and the Rev. Mr. Grier.† On these two points, one of them regarding the Celibacy of the clergy, the other Communion under one kind, the last-named gentleman says : "I join issue with Dr. M."‡ I will state each of them briefly, yet clearly. Our B. Saviour having condemned the Jewish practice of divorce : *His disciples say unto him : if the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry. But he said unto them : All men RECEIVE NOT this saying ;* in Greek : *οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τοὺς λόγους τούτους.* Mat. xix. 2. In like manner St. Paul says, I. Cor. vii. 7, *I say therefore to the unmarried and widows : it is good for them, if they abide even as I ; But if they DO NOT CONTAIN let them marry ;* in Greek : *εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγγηγάταισιν :* Now

* For example, in the Epistle of First Sunday after Epiph. Rom. xii. 1. the text stood thus : *Be ye changed in your shape.* In the Epist. for Sunday before Easter, Philip ii. 5, Christ was said to be *found in his apparel as a man.* Collier, P. ii. p. 878.

† End of Controv., Let. ix. p. 72.

‡ P. 95.

in both these passages, the later as well as the earlier Protestant translators change DO NOT into CANNOT, in excuse for the first Reformers' breach of their vowed celibacy.* With respect to the former of these falsifications, Dr. Ryan derides it, and says, "The Rhemish version agrees *nearly* with our own!"† while the Vicar refers to his former work for a satisfactory proof that the word CANNOT "is most agreeable to the original,"‡ which says DO NOT. As to the second falsification, the Vicar says, "I have been obliged to convict Dr. M. of gross ignorance of the Greek, no less than a fraudulent application of the Latin, and have proved to demonstration that the Rhemish version of this text: *ei de ouk συρρατινται* is erroneous."§ Now in what does this boasted conviction of my ignorance, and of the erroneousness of the Rhemish version, consist? Why the Vicar says that *συρρατινται* "is a verb of the middle voice," and that "the vulgate reading which agrees with it is: *si vero se non continent*,|| that is to say: *if they do not contain themselves*: therefore according to the Vicar, the passage ought to be translated: *if they cannot contain*, as in the common Bible! What is it that chicanery and confidence will not attempt to prove! The other instance of still subsisting error in the latter translation of the Bible, as well as in the former, consists in the false translation of I. Cor. xi. 27., where St. Paul, speaking of the B. Sacrament, says: *Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.* *ὅστις ὃς ἀν ἐσθῆν τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου ἢ πινῇ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἰσχυὸς ἵσται τοῦ σωματός καὶ αἱμάτων τοῦ κυρίου.* This text, which is so decisive in favour of the Catholic doctrine, respecting the body and blood of Christ being received under either kind in the B. Sacrament, is, on that account, falsified in both translations of the English Bible, by turning the disjunctive article OR, into the conjunctive article AND. Dr. Ryan finding

* Another falsification of the same kind, which seems to be levelled at the tenet of Freewill, occurs both in the earlier and later version of Galat. v. 17. The Apostle says: *You do NOT the things that you would.* *αὐ οὐκ ἔποιε ταῦτα ποιεῖς*; this the translators turn thus: *So that YOU CANNOT do the things that you would*, contrary to the original Greek, the Latin Vulgate, the Syriac, Arias Montanus, Erasmus, Beza, Tremellius, &c.—It is extraordinary that neither the Editor of the Rheims Testament nor Ward has pointed out this corruption.

† Analysis, p. 19.

‡ Reply, p. 95. On consulting the Book and page here referred to, the only words relating to the translation itself, consist in a repetition of Dr. Ryan's above-quoted falsehood, namely, he says: "The Rhemish construction does not substantially differ from the Protestant one." The rest of his long dissertation is made up of his own confused exposition of the Scripture and the Fathers on the subject of celibacy. See Answer to Ward, p. p. 33, 34, 35.

§ Ibid. p. 95.

|| Answer, p. 35.

this falsification (which Ward does not fail to expose) too gross to be defended, very prudently passes it by unanswered. The Vicar had in his former work, attempted to prove that *καί*, OR and AND are convertible articles ! at present he contents himself with relating a story about Dr. Kilbie, who, he says, hearing a certain clergyman maintain in the pulpit that there are *three arguments against the translation* of a certain word, in the way it has been translated, answered him that there are *thirteen reasons why it should be translated* as it stands ; concluding thus : “ to Dr. M. I leave the application of the foregoing anecdote ; for it certainly affords a useful hint to a self-confident critic.” Such is the *issue* of the contest to which the Vicar challenged me ! And such are his reasons for showing that the term DO NOT, should be translated CANNOT, and why the disjunctive OR, should be changed into the conjunctive AND. I hope you will not forget Dr. Kilbie : if I do not mistake, the Vicar will again introduce him to you. In the mean time, I remain,

Yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

P. S. The Vicar’s mode of reasoning on the corruption in question is of a piece with that of Luther, quoted by me in Letters to a Prebendary, Let. v. p. 187, when being called to an account for an undeniable false translation of Scripture, he answered, “ *sic volo, sic jubeo, Lutherusita vult et ait se doctorem esse supra omnes doctores in toto Papatu.*”

LETTER VIII.

Variations of the Bible from its Originals.

DEAR SIR :—In a former letter you have seen the Vicar take both sides of a contested point : you will now witness two other instances of the same inconsistency, namely, in his defending the Common Bible against its Originals, and again in defending the Originals against the common Bible. The subject, which the Vicar treated in two distinct chapters previously to the one last discussed, naturally falls into its place after it. In his fourth chapter, referred to above, the Rev. Gentleman, after speaking in the loftiest terms of the new translation of the Scripture, published by the authority of James I., in 1611, says of its authors : “ they looked to nothing as authority, but the Hebrew text of the Old and the original Greek of the

New Testament." For, as they express themselves in their Preface or Epistle to the reader: "if you ask what they, the translators, had before them? Truly it was the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and the Greek of the New. These are the two golden pipes or rather conduits where-through the olive branches empty themselves into the golde."* "These tongues, therefore, we say, the Scripture in these tongues, were set before us to translate, BEING THE TONGUES WHEREIN GOD WAS PLEASED TO SPEAK TO HIS CHURCH BY THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES."† The Vicar had before said, that "Dr. M.'s infallible Church was guilty of an error in determining its Canon from an interpolated Greek copy of the Bible;" adding, in the notes, "they were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin translations of the Old Testament) but out of the Greek stream; therefore, the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin, derived from it, must needs be muddy."‡ Having noticed these positions, you have next to observe, Dear Sir, that the Vicar's above-mentioned fourth chapter was written in answer to the following passage in *The End of Controversy*: "supposing the divine authority of the sacred books themselves to be fully established, how do you know, without the tradition and authority of the Church, that the copies of them, translated and printed in your Bible, are authentic? I will not lead you into the labyrinth of Biblical criticism, but will content myself with referring you to your own Bible-book, printed by authority. Look, then, at Psalm xiv., as it occurs in the *Common Prayer*, and which therefore is the text to which your clergy swear their consent and assent: then look at the same Psalm in the Bible now in use: you will find four whole verses in the former, which are left out of the latter! What will you here say? You must say that your Church has *added to*, or else that she *has taken from the words of the prophecy*." Rev. xxii. 18, 19.§ In fact, no axiom of mathematics is more evident than this disjunctive proposition, and no man either of common can-

* Reply, p. 63.

† P. 64.

‡ Reply, p. 6.—N.B. The Greek version, called the Septuagint, and the Latin Vulgate of the Old Testament, were both made from the Hebrew at times when this text was pure. Accordingly the former is constantly quoted by the Evangelists and St. Paul, and the latter, together with the New Testament, has been religiously preserved from error by the care and constant use of the Latin Church, since the time of the Apostles. But the Hebrew text having been almost entirely confined to the Jews for more than a thousand years, was in a very faulty state when Protestants began to translate it in the sixteenth century. This is acknowledged by Dr. Brett, Dr. Kennicot, and the learned in general.

§ End of Controv., Let. ix., p. 70. It is necessary to observe, that what is the fourteenth Psalm in the Prayer Book, is the thirteenth in the Vulgate.

dour, or even of common sense, would venture, at least publicly, to deny it. Regardless, however, of consequences, the Vicar maintains, in the face of the world, both parts of the disjunctive, that is, he pretends to reconcile a contradiction; expressly maintaining that "the Church of England has neither added to nor taken from the word of the prophecy,"* when she added the four verses in question to the 14th Psalm in her Liturgy; nor when she excluded them from that Psalm in her authorized Bible!

In vindication of the additional verses as they stand in the Common Prayer, which he himself has sworn to, the Vicar alleges, that "the Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer were translated from the *Septuagint and the Latin vulgate*;"† in both which these verses are found, that "it is now generally admitted among the learned, that the Old translation (made by Coverdale) is preferable to the New," because "even when the sense is not very clear, nor the connexion of the ideas obvious at first sight, the mind is soothed, and the ear ravished with the powerful yet unaffected charms of style!" In a word, that "the Reviewers of the Liturgy in 1661, consulted the *public taste* in retaining the Old translation, made by Coverdale."‡ Do then *the public taste*, and *the charms of style*, constitute a sufficient reason for preferring *the muddy waters of the Latin*, derived from the *impure stream of the Greek*, to the *Hebrew fountain*, and for stopping up *the golden pipes, where-through the olive branches empty themselves into the golde*; in a word, for interpolating the word of God, by adding a full third part to an inspired Psalm, which is supposed not to belong to it? Such are *the motives*, as the Vicar calls them, which "show the futility of Dr. M.'s animadversions."§ On the other hand, by way of defending the new translated Bible, which excludes the four verses, against the Common Prayer Book, which retains them, as the word of God, he says that "Bythnar, when he analyses the fourteenth Psalm, does not notice those verses: that A. B. Parker omitted them in the Bishop's Bible, and that "in Barker's edition (the Genevan) there is a note setting forth that the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses of the fourteenth Psalm, of the common translation, are not in the Hebrew text, and that they were rather *put in, the more fully to express the manners of the wicked.*"|| This avowal of "the more ancient and venerable Translators of the Bible," that they have *added* the verses in question *to the original text*, and that "they did so *more fully to express the manners of the wicked,*" according to the doctrine of the Vicar, justifies both the old Translators in retaining them, and the new

* Reply, p. 38. † P. 40. ‡ Reply, 37. § P. 35. || P. 39.

ones in excluding them ! Such is the chicanery of the Vicar's logic ! And whereas I quoted St. Paul, who repeats the verses omitted in the common Bible, Rom. iii. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, as they stand in the Vulgate, the Septuagint, and the Douay Bible : he hunts through the other Psalms, the Proverbs, and Isaiah, for various passages to which St. Paul may be supposed to have *alluded*, when he quoted them from the Old Testament, instead of taking them altogether as they stand in the fourteenth Psalm, according to the Septuagint, and, in all probability, to the Hebrew likewise, in the time of the Apostle.

" Having disproved (says the Rev. Vicar, in his third chapter) the charge of defectiveness, which Dr. M. has brought against our English Bible respecting the fourteenth Psalm, I proceed to consider one of an opposite description which he has proffered, under the sanction of Bishop Tomline's name, *viz.* that of *redundancy* as to a particular text."* The fact is, I accused the English Bible neither of *defectiveness* nor *redundancy*, but barely argued from the striking difference between the text of the fourteenth Psalm, as it stands in the Common Prayer Book and in the Common Bible, and between the text of 1 John, v. 7., as it stands in the Testament, and the *original Greek manuscripts*, as B. Tomline, B. Marsh, and the learned, in general, agree together, concerning their rendering of this contested passage, how indispensably necessary the tradition and authority of the church are, for enabling a reader of the Scripture to know what books and parts of books are or are not authentic. It is the Vicar's officiousness that drags to public notice the present subjects of Biblical criticism : for which certainly he will not receive the thanks he expected. He proceeds as follows : " The Bishop of Lincoln, now of Winchester, says Dr. M., has published his conviction, that the most important passage in the Testament for establishing the divinity of Jesus Christ, 1 John v. 7, is spurious."† Now, Dear Sir, as we Catholics, receive this testimony of the Apostle in our Vulgate, for the inspired word of God, I must have been an idiot to charge the Church of England with *redundancy* in receiving it, as the Vicar makes me do. Nor could I, without gross inconsistency, ascribe to B. Tomline, who admits the divinity of Christ, but rejects the text of St. John, the assertion that the latter, namely, the text, " is the most important passage in the New Testament for establishing the former, namely, Christ's divinity." No, Sir, you will see, on referring to *The End of Controversy*,‡ that what I said of the *importance of the text*, I said from myself, and that I barely quoted B. Tomline (which I did by using the customary marks of quotations), as declaring that the text

* Reply, p. 42. † *Ibid.* ‡ Letter IX. p. 70, note.

“is spurious.” With what pretensions then to honour or candour, does the Vicar make a parade of showing that the Bishop builds the doctrine itself on other texts of Scripture, and reproach me, as he does in the following words: “when this is the simple statement of the fact, what shall be said of Dr. M., who thus makes assertions which, a reference to the authority to which he appeals, proves to be unfounded? But even if he did not know that they were so, will ignorance justify error?”*

The substance of what the Rev. Vicar advances on this celebrated text, of the *Three Heavenly Witnesses*, 1 John v. 7, is that not only B. Tomline, but also B. Marsh abandons it as indefensible; that Griesback declares it to be (namely, in the printed Greek editions), an interpolation from the Latin Vulgate, in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and that there are but two MSS. extant which contain it:† and these very MSS. the Vicar maintains, are of a late date.‡ Still he proceeds as follows. “Notwithstanding all this mass of evidence against it (the text of 1 John v. 7,) and that Bishops Tomline and Marsh have strengthened it by their powerful support, yet as I see such invincible arguments brought forward on the opposite side by the Rev. Mr. Nolan, which are also supported by other writers of high established reputation, I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against it,‡ and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt of the genuineness of the rest of St. John’s Epistle, as that of the disputed passage.”§ The Vicar’s *invincible arguments* for the authenticity of the text, *in opposition to all the original Greek MSS.*, are these, as he cites them from the Rev. Mr. Nolan: “That Eusebius, who at the instance of Constantine, had prepared fifty written copies of the Scriptures, had expunged, rather than the Orthodox had inserted this passage in the sacred text. The power with which the Emperor’s orders had invested Eusebius, his inclination to exercise that power in the suppression of that particular verse, the unlimited sway of Arianism, &c., and lastly, the evidence in favour of the contested passage afforded by the African Church, present more

* Reply, p. 44.

† P. 45.—It was the great superiority of the late Professor Porson over his antagonist Archdeacon Travis, which about forty years ago destroyed the authority of this text, and with it the belief of Christ’s Divinity, in the minds of most learned Protestants. Catholics who adhere to the Vulgate and hold Tradition no less than Scripture as their Rule, are little affected by the unequal contest alluded to of Greek Manuscripts and printed editions.

‡ Reply p. 46.

§ The Rev. Mr. Grier in his *Answer to Ward’s Errata*, says: “Now, as to this text, there is stronger evidence that it does not than that it does belong to the Epistle of St. John.” Pref. p. 26.

than presumptive proof that it is genuine.”* He adds, from the same Mr. Nolan, that, “The proper witnesses of the inspired word are the Greek and the *Latin Churches* ;” and that when as many as four hundred Bishops of the Latin Church† “were summoned to Carthage by Hunneric, an Arian King, to defend their doctrine, they distinctly referred to its authority,” namely that of 1 John v. 7.‡—These, and other facts and testimonies to the same purport, which the Vicar adduces, are *not proofs against* me of there being *no redundancy* in the English Testament, where it exhibits this text : as he, from a confusion of ideas, again and again represents me as charging it with ; but they are proofs for me, as to the real point I undertook to prove, namely, that the Church of England, in this no less than in the former instance, is constrained to desert the boasted *pure fountain* of the *original text*, as polluted, and to drink of the pretended *muddy stream* of the *Latin Vulgate*. For it was in this text, according to the confession of the Vicar and his authorities, that the divine testimony in question of the Unity and Trinity was preserved for the use of the Protestant Bible, when it had disappeared from every existing Greek MS. This shows the just grounds on which the Prelates of the Council of Trent preferred their own Latin text to every other. It proves, moreover, that the unwritten word or tradition is of its own nature, a more secure depository of revealed truths, than is the written word, Scripture. For, if one Emperor, and one Bishop were able, by means of fifty corrupt copies of the Testament, to vitiate the whole existing text of it in a most important passage relating to the Divine nature ; what thinking man, who builds upon Scripture alone, will vouch with absolute certainty for the authenticity of any other part of it whatsoever ? Whereas it is evident that all the Sovereigns and Bishops in the world could not, at any period whatsoever, make five hundred millions of Christians believe that Christ is corporally present in the B. Sacrament, if they had not previously believed it.

I have more than once observed that, undertaking as the Vicar does, to answer “all Dr. M—’s principal arguments,”§ he generally overlooks the most weighty of them. Thus with respect to the author’s ninth letter, the only one, among the twelve which compose the first part of his work, which the Rev. Gen-

* Reply, p. 47.

† The total number of Bishops and Confessors from different parts of Africa, Sardinia, Majorca, and other adjoining parts of the Latin Church, who assisted at this Conference, was 866. See Labbe’s Councils, Tom. iv. p. 1154.

‡ Reply, p. 49.

§ Pref. Rem., p. xliv.

He is pleased to notice, he confines his disquisitions to *the Canon and the Translation* of the English Bible, neither of which the author shows can be depended upon with sufficient safety by a consistent Protestant. As to such Protestant's insecurity, in other respects, and particularly with respect to the meaning of the sacred text, in numberless passages of it, without the tradition and guidance of the Church (which insecurity I demonstrated by reason and by the authority of Protestants, as well as Catholics), the Vicar takes no notice of it whatever; nor does he even contest the author's arguments, in proof that no Protestant, resting solely on his own private interpretation of Scripture, can make an Act of Faith on any article whatsoever. "The utmost (I said) he can affirm is: *such and such appears to me, at the present moment, to be the sense of the text before me*, but perhaps, upon further consideration, I may alter my opinion."* Having proved the insecurity of those who *will not hear the Church*, I proceeded to describe their uncertainty, doubts, and fears, during life, and more particularly at the approach of death; on which occasion I mentioned the unsettled state of the late Bishop Watson's mind on religious subjects of the last importance, as the same appears by his publications, and particularly by his Pastoral Charge to his Clergy in the year 1795. In this, speaking of the doctrines of the Christian Religion, he says to them: "I think it safer to tell you where they are contained than what they are. They are contained in the Bible; and if, in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity should be different from those of your neighbour, or from those of the Church, be persuaded, on your part, that infallibility appertains as little to you, as it does to the church." Hence I concluded that this learned Bishop's mind "was so far removed from the assurance of faith," that it was not even settled with respect to the fundamental articles of his own Church, Church's creed, and Liturgy; the same which he was in the habit of proclaiming in the three Creeds, and of swearing to on a variety of occasions. Indeed I cannot conceive language more expressive of *Religious Scepticism*, or that inculcates it more forcibly, than that which the Prelate here makes use of to his Clergy. On this subject, the Rev. Vicar, who had been silent on others of much greater importance, which are proposed in the *End of Controversy*, raises his voice in defence of Bishop Watson, whom, next to Bishop Tomline, he charges me with subjecting to my animadversions, though I have not animadverted on the latter in any disrespectful way at all. He now undertakes, by giving "an enlarged view of that

* End of Controv. Lett. IX. p. 77.

eminent Divine's Charge," instead of what he calls my "garbled extract," to show how grossly I misrepresented him. The following constitutes the Vicar's *enlarged view*: "When we speak," says B. Watson, "concerning the truth of revealed Religion, we include not only the certainty of the divine missions of Moses and Jesus, but the nature of the several doctrines promulgated by them to mankind. Now you may ask me, what those doctrines are? I know what they are to me; but, pretending to no degree of infallibility, I think it safer to tell you where they are contained, than what they are. They are contained in the Bible, and if, in reading that book, your sentiments concerning the doctrines of Christianity, should be different from those of your neighbour, or from those of the Church, be persuaded that infallibility appertains as little to you as it does to the Church." Now, Dear Sir, I would ask you or any other man, except the Vicar, how the latter's enlargement of the quotation from Dr. Watson's Charge, tends to prove that the Bishop, after all his reading and writing on theological subjects, had acquired a *certain knowledge*, and much more the *Security of Faith*, as to the point in question, namely, "*What are the doctrines promulgated by Moses and Jesus?*" For if he had acquired this knowledge, with respect to the thirty-nine Articles, or the three Creeds, or so much as the Blessed Trinity and the Divine nature of Jesus Christ, he could not have avoided telling his Clergy thus much. In fact the whole sense of the Vicar's additional citation is reduced to these two points, that the mission of *Moses and Jesus were divine*, and that their *doctrines, whatever these may be, are divine also*; but *what these doctrines are?* which is the point in question, he declines to say. The Vicar, indeed, maintains, in the same page, that "His Lordship was not removed from the *assurance of Faith*;" and that "the orthodoxy of his principles is indefensible."* I presume, however, that no other Christian ever did, or ever will, advance such absurdity. What, a person destitute of orthodoxy, in other words a heretic, nay an *impious* heretic, and a sceptic in Religious matters, as the Bishop in question was, may still have even the *assurance of Faith*! I can say nothing to heighten such absurdity! I grant that the Bishop says in the quoted passage: "I know what they (the doctrines promulgated by Moses and Jesus) are *to me*." But then, it appears from this very passage, considering the whole of its context and accompanying circumstances, and it is evident from various other passages in his Lordship's writings, that the knowledge he speaks of was confined to the two above-mentioned points; namely, that Moses

* Reply, p. 55.

and Christ were messengers sent by God, and that the messages which they delivered are true, without pretending to any certain knowledge, what any of them consist in. Thus much is clear from the *Anecdotes of his Life*, written by himself, and lately published by his son, that the doctrine of the Church of England, though he had frequently sworn to it, was by no means the standard of his belief, as he used his utmost endeavours to get all subscription to her Articles (as also one of her Creeds, appointed by her to be publicly recited on thirteen several days of the year) suppressed, and the whole of her Liturgy revised, with a view to its entire change. In short, he boasts that Bishop Hoadley, who acknowledged no Church, no Sacraments, nor other ordinances as of divine institution, was his prototype in his religious as well as civil notions.* On the other hand, it is undeniable that B. Watson puts the *Unitarian*, who denies the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and the *worshipper of Jesus*, as he contemptuously calls the true Christian, on a level, as equally deserving the divine mercy, in his Preface to *The Theological Tracts*.† Finally, in his *Apology for Christianity*, he publishes his own Latitudinarian Creed, as being that of the Established Church, where, after ridiculing the Zealots of the Church of Rome, &c. he boasts that "The Church of England will not abandon the moderation, by which she permits every individual ET SENTIRE QUÆ VELIT, ET QUÆ SENTIAT DICERE;"‡ that is, *to think what he wills and to say what he thinks!* Such is the Protestant Bishop, whom the Vicar of Templebodane describes as having attained to "the assurance of faith!" and as being "the most capable not merely of ascertaining, but of accurately defining the Christian doctrines!"§ I take it for granted, that the Vicar's six pages of panegyric on the Latitudinarian Bishop Watson, did not catch the eye of the Rt. Hon. Viscount, whose "devoted attachment to the Established Religion of the State, pointed him out to that Vicar, as the individual more than another," to address his book to; otherwise he never would have accepted of its dedication, and much less have recommended it, together with its author, to the Royal Patronage.

I am, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* *Anecdotes of the Life of Bishop Watson*, written by himself. See Vol. I., p. 70, p. 394, p. 398, &c.

† Pref. p. xvii.

‡ Apol. p. 3.

§ Reply, p. 56.

LETTER IX.

Real Presence and Transubstantiation.

DEAR SIR :—The whole of my adversary's four preceding Chapters have been very uselessly taken up with combating a very few lines in my ninth Letter of *The End of Controversy*. Such is the nature of his complete REPLY to that work ! He now flies off, at once, to my thirty-sixth Letter, which is on Transubstantiation, as the most inviting subject for the display of his logic and learning. I do not follow his example ; nevertheless, while I give a fair and full answer to whatever is material in his book, I still claim a right to adopt such order in the arrangement of my subjects and arguments as appears to me most lucid and natural for this purpose, and which is, for the most part, the same that is followed in *The End of Controversy*

The author of the work last mentioned, enters upon the present subject with complaining of the too disingenuous practice of polemics on the opposite side of the question ; first, in representing Catholics as *Idolators, by worshipping bread and wine* in the B. Sacrament, knowing, at the same time, as they do, that Catholics hold, as an article of faith, that *there is no bread nor wine in it, but only Jesus Christ*, true God and true Man ; secondly, in their overlooking or disguising the principal matter in debate ; which is, whether Christ is, or is not really and corporeally present in the Eucharist ? and in the meantime directing all the force of their declamation, ridicule and civil disqualifications against a point of an inferior or secondary consideration, namely, the *manner* by which he becomes present in it, which Catholics believe to be by *Transubstantiation*. In the mean time, our mistaken countrymen tolerate and protect the Lutheran systems of *Consubstantiation*, *Impanation*, and other Protestant systems, which are liable to most of the objections they bring against the Catholics.* To the former of these complaints the Vicar replies, with a confidence that merits a harder name than disingenuity, that “ Dr. M. must be conscious that nothing distinguished so much them (the English, and I suppose the Irish Protestant Clergy, including the Vicar himself) from their adversaries, as candour and fair dealing.”†

* End of Controv. Letter xxxvi. p. 37.

† Reply, p. 118.

Not to notice, however, either his boasts or his abuse any further, I observe, that he is much annoyed by the examples I brought to prove that Catholics are not guilty of Idolatry in worshipping Christ in the Sacrament, even though they should be mistaken as to the fact of his being present in the Sacrament, while their whole intention and the homage of their hearts are directed to him alone, and while they expressly reject the adoration of bread and wine, as unlawful and Idolatrous. I supposed that those Jews who mistook St. John the Baptist for Christ, to have paid him divine worship: now, would they, I asked, be guilty, in this case, of Idolatry? Or, if a loyal subject, charged with a dutiful address to the King, should by mistake, present it to one of his courtiers, or even to a waxen figure of him, robed and crowned, and made perfectly to represent him, would there be any treason or disloyalty in this case; while the heart and intention of the subject in question were perfectly upright and faithful? To this the Vicar answers: "It is much to be lamented that a gentleman, like Dr. M., who possesses such a versatility of talent, so much learning, and such acute observation on every other subject, should appear to betray symptoms of an impaired intellect in religious concerns alone. —I should wish to know from him what similitude exists between an address intended for the Sovereign (*in the case supposed*), and a solemn act of religious worship?"† My answer is (without claiming those high qualifications which the Vicar is pleased to ascribe to me) that *I have clearly shown the similitude he calls for; and that he perfectly fails in his attempts to show a dissimilitude.* What he says is this: "There is no resemblance between a solitary act—and a systematic observance—during a succession of ages." I answer: that if the upright and loyal intention of a good subject will excuse one mistake, of the nature described, it will excuse several such acts, however habitual or long continued. He then says: "No two things can be more unlike than civil worship to man and adoration to God." True, one is human and the other divine; and yet the perfection of both depends, in a great measure, on the intention and heart of the person who pays them. He next, in a great many needless words, states a supposition that the loyal subject had been told that he was paying homage to a statue, and not to the King; I answer that to make this supposition bear upon the point in question; namely, to prove that I, for example, am an idolator in worshipping Christ in the Sacrament, it is necessary to suppose also that I ought to pay more attention

* End of Controv. p. 40.

† Reply, p. 120.

to the admonitions and arguments of the Vicar of Templebaldane, and of certain other modern divines, who cannot agree among themselves upon any thing, except that it is necessary to reject the Catholic doctrine, than to the express texts of the four Evangelists and St. Paul, to the unanimous testimony of the ancient Fathers, and to the tradition of the whole Church, as likewise of all those heretical and schismatical sects, who abandoned it, down to the date of Luther's celebrated conference with Satan. But, continues the Vicar, "the idolatrous Jews, who worshipped the molten calf, might have excused themselves in the same way; as by such worship they did not intend to withdraw their allegiance from the true God who brought them out of the land of Egypt."* In asserting this, the Vicar expressly contradicts the sacred text, which says of these Israelites: *They made a calf in Horeb, and worshipped the molten image. They forgot God, their Saviour, which had done great things in Egypt.* Ps. cvi. alias cv. 19, 21. It is clear that they meant to worship the Bull Apis, which they had been accustomed to worship in Egypt: and had they really meant to pay homage to the true God, it would have been sinful in them to pay this to him, under the form of a beast. As to the Vicar's pretension that these Idolaters "conceived that after Aaron's consecration of the golden calf, the accidents or species of the gold alone remained, while the substance of it was annihilated, and that under those God himself was present:†" I say, it is evidently a pure production of his own imagination, without authority or probability of any kind whatever. The same may be said of the defence he sets up for the idolatry of the Manichees and the Pagans. He concludes his vain attempt to fix the guilt of Idolatry on the Catholics, for worshipping Christ in the B. Sacrament, by stating a great number of cases which may occur to prevent a real consecration of the elements: but all these have been fully answered, in what has been said above concerning the supposed errors of the pious Jews in worshipping St. John the Baptist for Christ, and of the loyal subject, who might address a royal courtier or representation of the King, for the King himself.

You will recollect, Dear Sir, that I have thus far been clearing Catholics of the horrid charge of idolatry, brought against them by the Vicar and his associated polemics, and erroneously sanctioned by the Legislature, on the supposition that the Great Universal Church is, and has been for so many centuries deceived in her belief of Christ's real and substantial presence in the Holy Sacrament. As to what the Vicar supposes p. 123, where

* P. 125.

† P. 126.

he asks: "How can the sincerity of their belief that the bread and wine are really God, lessen the idolatry; inasmuch as it is in the *error of the belief*, as well as the *falsehood of the doctrine* that idolatry consists? it is every way groundless and absurd. Catholics abjure the idolatry of worshipping bread and wine for God." On the other hand, idolatry consists neither in *error of belief* nor in *falsehood of doctrine*, but in the *act of giving to a creature the honour which belongs to God*. But, what demonstrative proofs have not I,* and other Catholic Divines adduced, from every passage of Scripture, in which this Sacrament is mentioned, from every Father, who treats of it, from every proof that the Catholic Church is the true Church, from the confession of those different Churches and sects which have broken off from her communion,† and from the impossibility of a change having at any time taken place in the faith of five hundred millions of Christians with respect to this article: What demonstrative proofs, I say, have I not adduced, that the Catholic Church is not deceived in this her belief, but that, on the contrary, the various and discordant sects of Protestants are unhappily involved in error and impiety on this fundamental point.

I complained, at the beginning of this letter, as well as in *The End of Controversy*, not only of the charge of idolatry so unjustly brought against Catholics, on the subject of the Eucharist, but also of the disingenuity of Protestant Controvertists and Preachers, in keeping the first and principal question at issue out of the sight and minds of their readers and hearers, as far as this is in their power, namely, whether Christ is or is not *really and substantially* present in the Sacrament? and, directing the whole scope of their declamation and ridicule against the mode by which Catholics believe Christ renders himself present in it, namely, by a conversion of bread and wine into his flesh and blood, which is therefore called *transubstantiation*. In aid of this disingenuous conduct, I mentioned that the same persons are accustomed to disguise their real tenets on the former head, by adopting language more or less conformable to that of Catholics and of Holy Scripture.‡ You have seen above, Dear

* End of Controv. Letter xxxvii. p. 46, &c.

† Greek, Russian, Armenian, Eutychian, and Nestorian Christians may be met with at the Royal Exchange, all of whom will testify, that their respective Churches, some of which have existed for these eight centuries, others for these thirteen centuries and a half, believe as firmly in the real presence and transubstantiation, as the Catholic Church does. The learned and accomplished Dr. Smirnov, Chaplain to the Russian Embassy, who lives in Wimpole Street, Cavendish Square, will bear testimony to the faith of the Grecian and Russian Churches in this and other particulars.

‡ End of Controv., Letter xxxvi. p. 39; Letter xxxvii. p. 44.

Sir, how the Vicar takes fire at the charge of *disingenuity*, brought against Protestant polemics, and yet none of them, whom I have met with, are more guilty of it than himself. The Articles of the Church of England declare that the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the "supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Sacrament is faith." Art. 28. To this is added in the original formula as it was drawn up by Cranmer, approved in Convocation, and approved by Parliament, what follows: "A faithful man ought not either to believe, or openly to confess *the real* and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's supper."* Conformable to this declaration of Christ's *spiritual presence* in the Sacrament has been the language and doctrine of English Protestant Divines in general; but this Hibernian Champion of the English Church positively and repeatedly asserts that *Christ's body and blood are REALLY contained in the Sacrament*. He has even the confidence to appeal to the Articles, as compared with the Canons of The Council of Trent, in proof that "Both Churches agree about Christ's REAL PRESENCE in the Sacrament, and that the great dispute between them relates to the nature of it." He adds: "Neither of us, therefore, can use the words REAL PRESENCE, as descriptive of our differences, or of our peculiar opinions, without further illustration, unless through ignorance, or with an intention to deceive."† Yet, after all, Dear Sir, it is barely for the purpose of disguising his sentiments, and appearing to talk the language of Scripture, that the Vicar adopts this term, and so emphatically asserts that Jesus Christ is REALLY present in the H. Eucharist. This soon appears, when he assigns his reason for believing in this pretended *Reality*. He says: "Protestants believe Christ to be *really present* in the Sacrament, because they believe in his *ubiquity*,‡ or *presence every where*. I have, in a former letter, exposed and refuted this monstrous error of *Christ's ubiquity*, which would imply that he was never born into this world, nor ever stirred from one place to another in it, nor ever ascended into Heaven from it. But to confine myself to the present point: If Christ be present in the *Lord's supper*, because *he is every where*, then he is present in every other supper and meal we take share of, no less than in that, and of course the magnificent promises and assurances of Christ, namely: *The Bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world;*

* See the 42 Articles, A.D. 1552, in Heylin, Bernet, &c. Art. 29.

† Reply, p. 117, p. 139.

‡ P. 140.

John vi. 52. *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*; v. 56. *He that eateth me, the same shall live by me*, v. 58. &c., and in like manner the terrible denunciations of Paul: *Whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, 1 Cor. xi. 27. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself*, v. 29. All these, I say, are to pass for empty sounds. In the mean time the Vicar, with the Bishops Porteus, Burgess, and others, will still be free to boast that he builds his Religion on *the plain obvious sense of Scripture*, and to reproach the Catholics with distorting the latter by glosses and forced constructions from its natural meaning. True it is, he says, on this subject, but most inconsistently, what follows. Most cordially do I agree with Dr. M., that our Saviour did not intend to deceive his Apostles, when he instituted the Sacrament, and was on the point of leaving them and bequeathing them the legacy of his love. For, *He who did not sin, neither was guile found in his mouth*, could not practise deception. We must be perfectly convinced, that he only designed by this ceremony (that of taking bread, blessing it, and giving it to them, saying, Take ye and eat, THIS IS MY BODY), that they should *remember him and his body broken for them*.* Hence I infer that, in bequeathing this legacy of his love, Christ meant what he said. True it is also, that the Vicar supports his opinion by that of B. Taylor and the present Bishop of Durham; the former of whom says: "Christ is no way present in the Sacrament as to his *human nature*; He is present there by *his divine power*; but, for any other presence it is *Idolum*, it is nothing in the world;" while the latter maintains that "to eat Christ is an act of faith of the mind, not of the body."† Still, I say it is evident, that these polemics prove nothing else by their assertions, except to what an extent of inconsistency and impiety against the express word of God, a determined opposition to his holy Church is capable of carrying men of talents and learning. Look over again, My Dear Sir, I beseech you, the passages of Scripture I have quoted, and likewise the assertions of the Vicar and his two Episcopal authorities, and reflect whether you ever witnessed greater absurdity or opposition to the sacred Text than are contained in the latter. According to them, Christ, who, you know, consists of a Human as well as a Divine nature, is *really* present in the Sacrament, and yet he is only present in it by *his divine power*, every other presence being *Idolum*, that is, nothing in the world! He gives us *his flesh indeed and his blood indeed*, to eat and drink, when he gives us mere

* P. 152.

† P. 143, p. 144.

bread and wine *to remember him and his body broken!* We verily *eat and drink Christ*, by exercising *an act of the mind*, without *an act of the body!* And, though this meat and drink are nothing but *types and representations* of Christ, who is as really present in every other kind of meat and drink as he is in those of the Sacrament, yet he that eats and drinks the latter, unworthily, or without faith, *eats and drinks damnation to himself!* But, whereas there are other and more striking representations of Christ and *his body broken* than bread and wine are: for example, the concluding chapters of the four Evangelists, or a pious picture of the Last Supper, or of the Crucifixion, it might be said, according to the Vicar's theology, *he that looks upon any of them, without faith, eats and drinks damnation to himself!* In short, it is plain that Protestants, to get rid of the mysteries implied in the literal text, in each one of their numerous systems, plunge into inextricable inconsistencies and contradictions; as the poet Dryden pointedly expresses in the lines I before quoted.*

The literal sense is hard to flesh and blood:—
But nonsense never could be understood.

Hind and Panther.

The Vicar next proceeds to the desperate attempt of pressing the Ancient Fathers into his service, by proving that they did not believe in Transubstantiation and the Real Presence; but this will prove an ample subject for another letter.

I am, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* At the beginning of the Reformation Erasmus ridiculed the idea of an *imaginary feast on an ideal victim*, by mere faith, which some Protestants then held in the following manner: Having borrowed from one of them his horse, called *Frederic*, when the latter sent to have it returned to him, instead of the Horse, Erasmus sent him the following lines:

“Quod mihi dixisti, De Corpore Christi: Credo quod habes, et habes
“Hoc tibi jam dico, De tuo Frederico; Crede quod habes et habes.”

LETTER X.

Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers for the Real Presence and Transubstantiation.

DEAR SIR :—Luther, who was a learned and intelligent man, and, whether the Vicar allows it or not, the *Father of* what is called *The Reformation*, had too much sense to trust his cause to the testimony of the Ancient Fathers. Accordingly, in one of his books against Erasmus, he thus reproaches him : “ You do well to boast of the Fathers, since they have, all of them together, neglected St. Paul.”* The famous polemic Whitaker, affirms that “ The Popish Religion is a patched coverlid of the Fathers’ errors sewed together.”† His contemporary, Dr. Humphrey, with whom the Vicar’s friend Fulk joins, complains that Bishop Jewel, by his bold appeal to the Fathers, “ gave the Papists too large a scope, injured himself, and, after a manner, spoiled himself and his Church.”‡ Most other learned Protestants, of later times, give up the ancient Fathers to the Catholics as their natural Fathers, one of whom, the celebrated Dr. Conyers Middleton, speaking of the practice of those Protestants who appeal to the primitive Fathers and Councils, says : “ From the little success that it has had, or even can have in our controversies with Papists, it is evident that it cannot be considered in any other light than as a vain ostentation of learning, and an impatient zeal to repel that charge of ignorance and contempt of primitive antiquity, with which the Protestant Churches are constantly charged by the Romanists.” He adds : “ When Cranmer and Ridley had evinced the truth of their doctrines by clear and unanswerable testimonies of Scripture, it grieves me to see them labouring and gravelled at a passage of Chrysostom or Hilary, and giving their adversaries an occasion of triumph, by submitting to an authority which they were neither at liberty to reject, nor yet able to reconcile to their cause.”§ Nevertheless, the Vicar, to use his own words, being “ determined to deprive Dr. M. of the adventitious aid which he derived from their service,”|| undertakes, what with quibbling and what with bold assertions and denials, to turn those Greek and Latin writers of the six first centuries into Protestants of the Church of England, whether they will or will not.

* De Servo Arbitrio. Tom. ii.

† Contra Dureum.

‡ De Vita Jewelli.

§ Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers. p. 70. &c.

|| Prefat. Remarks. p. 43.

It is to be remarked, however, that whereas the B. Sacrament, besides the substance of Christ's body and blood, contains the figure and sign of them in the species or accidents of the bread and wine, which remain after the change of the latter, by the words of Christ have taken place, so the Fathers, especially in their controversies with certain subtle heretics, spoke of the latter—namely, the species, without any express mention of the former, namely, the substance, which was universally understood. Thus, some of them called the Eucharist a figure or representation; but, observe, that not one of them ever called it a *mere figure*, or bare representation.

To enter now into this vast field to which the Vicar challenges me: it is true that I quoted, in proof of the real presence, the words of the Apostolic Father S. Ignatius, who, reprobating certain heretics of his time, writes: "They do not admit of Eucharists and oblations, because *they do not believe the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ*, who suffered for our sins."* To this the Vicar objects, first, that I "stopped" and did not add the following words of the passage: "and which (*flesh*) was raised from the dead: they therefore resisting the grace of God, die in their disputes:"† words which evidently strengthen instead of weakening the reality of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament. This is a specimen of the *garbling* with which the Vicar reproaches me! He objects, in the second place, that I put the word *oblations* for the Greek word *προσευχης* in this passage: but first, if this were a wrong translation, it would not alter the drift of the quotation, which consists in the Father's condemning certain persons for *disbelieving the Eucharist to be the flesh of Christ*. But secondly, if you, Dear Sir, or any one else will consult the learned notes of the Editor of S. Ignatius, Cotelierius, p. 420, he will see abundant proofs from the usage of other Fathers, that the Greek word in question, means here, not *every kind of prayer*, but the liturgical prayer, or the Mass: accordingly the Great Theodoret, quoting this passage, uses the word *προσεφορας*, and not *προσευχης*. Indeed what pretext would the disbelief of Christ's flesh being in the Eucharist afford any person for abstaining from *ordinary prayer*?‡

* End of Controv. Letter xxxvii. p. 62.

† Reply, p. 155.

‡ The Vicar reproaches me, in a note of the quoted page, with having "overlooked the original, and taken the Father's meaning from a Latin version." He even insinuates that I am like some Italian Jesuit, who, he says, "thanked heaven that he was ignorant of Greek." I say nothing to this insult, except what will readily be believed, that few Jesuits are inferior to the generality of *Irish schoolmasters*, either in classical or scientific literature.

The Vicar next produces a garbled extract, both in Greek and English, from a passage of St. Justin's Second Apology, pretending that it is too long to be quoted in the whole of it; which however I will give you entire, and then leave you to judge for yourself, whether it "speaks the language of the Church of England," as the Vicar says it does,* or that of the Catholic Church (when I shall have reminded you, that the B. Sacrament after its consecration, continues to nourish the body of the receiver, by means of its outward part, or its accidents;) St. Justin, then, after describing the consecration and reception of the Eucharist, speaks of it thus: "For we do not receive these as common bread, or as common wine; but, in like manner, as Jesus Christ our Saviour, becoming incarnate by the word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation, so we are taught that the food by which, through digestion, our flesh and blood are nourished, being made the Eucharist by the prayers and the word of God, are the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus."—The Vicar next talks a great deal about a passage of St. Ireneus, which he admits the learned Protestant, Dr. Grave, considered as conclusive for Transubstantiation, but which he is afraid to produce. This then it remains for me to do. Disputing then against the heretics who denied that Christ was the Son of the World's Creator, and the Creator himself, this bright luminary of the second century writes thus: "How will it appear to them, that the bread, over which the blessing has been made, is the body of the Lord and the chalice of his blood, if they will not acknowledge that he is the son of the Creator of the world; that is to say, the word by which wood produces its fruit, fountains flow, which first produces the green herb, then the ear of corn, then the full wheat in the ear?"† He afterwards says: "When the mixed cup and the made bread perceives the Word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the blood and body of Christ."‡

The Vicar will not allow of the emphatical language in which St. Cyprian proved to Pope Cornelius the necessity of the lapsed Christians who were truly penitent being strengthened with the blood of Christ, in the Holy Sacrament, previously to their shedding their own blood for him, to be any proof of this Father's believing that Christ's real blood is contained in it: by way, then, of saving time, I wish to ask him, will he equally deny that St. Cyprian believed in the Real Presence, when he affirmed, in a Sermon, that "those (impenitent apostates) who receive the body and blood of Christ into their hands and their

* P. 157.

† Contra Hæc. l. iv. c. 34.

‡ Ibid. l. v. c. 2.

mouths, offer violence to them (*Vis infertur corpori et sanguini*,) and are guilty of a greater sin than when they denied the Lord?*** Will he deny the same, in reading the several miracles which St. Cyprian recounts respecting unworthy communicants, such as that of a guilty woman, who, on opening her box in which she kept the Sacrament, a fire burst forth from it; of a man in the same predicament, in whose hand the consecrated species was turned into ashes: and of an infant, who having received wine, polluted with idolatry, could not swallow a drop out of the sacred chalice? I should also like to ask him what the sacramental bread shut up in a box is in his system of theology?—I quoted Origen, who says, “Manna was formerly given as a figure, but now the flesh and blood of the Son of God are specifically given, and are real food.” The Vicar complains that he cannot find the passage quoted,† I will therefore furnish him with another from the same Father, where he says: “When you receive the holy food and that *incorruptible banquet*, you eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord.”‡ What proves that Origen speaks of the *Real Body* of Christ in the Sacrament, and *not of bread*, as the figure of it, is his calling it an *incorruptible banquet*. But, says the Vicar, Origen himself, elsewhere, calls the Sacrament a *typical and symbolical body*. Without recurring here to my former remark, namely, that Christ’s body is both *figuratively* and *really* present in the Sacrament: I answer, that the Rev. Gentleman’s criticism only proves how little he is versed in the phraseology of this Father, as it is usual with him to call every thing *typical* and *symbolical*, which has any kind of analogy with spiritual matters. Thus, for example, he says, that St. John *rested on the breast* of Christ *symbolically*;§ that, when Judas went out from the last supper, “*it was night symbolically*,”|| that the High Priest of the Jews was a *Symbolical Priest*, and that Bishops are forbidden *to have two wives symbolically*.¶ The Vicar’s second medium to prove that Origen’s language is “the same with that of the Church Catechism,” is, that the latter says: “The material part of the food, which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, goes into the belly and then into the draught.”*** But this is true, even on Catholic principles, as far as regards the outward part, or the accidents of the Sacrament.††

* Sermo. de Lapsis.

† I have here to acknowledge a mistake, in having referred to Origen’s Chapter vii. on *Levit.*, instead of Chapter vii. on *Numbers*.

‡ Hom. 5. On different places of the Gospel.

§ In Joan., tom. xxxii. p. 405.

|| Ibid, p. 412.

¶ In Mat. T. 14.

** Reply, p. 162.

†† Some of the Saints and other holy personages, who were ready, at all times, to shed their blood for the doctrine of the Real Presence and Tran-

But, supposing even it could be proved that this Father laid the foundation of the odious error of the *Stercorani*, which certain scholastics maintained in the ninth century, this would only prove, more strongly, that he held the Real corporal Presence and Transubstantiation.

The Vicar now produces S. Basil, who testifies that "As our Lord is the true bread, and his flesh is the true meat, it is necessary that the delightful pleasure which we receive from that bread, should be conveyed to us, *by our tasting it spiritually*."* But how, in the name of common sense, does this militate against the Real Presence? and what Catholic ever pretended to *taste the flesh of Christ* in the Sacrament? On the other hand, what proves this Father to have held the doctrine in question, is the striking comparison which he institutes, between the violators of the Sacrifice of the New Law and those of the ancient Sacrifices. "If," says he, "such threats were made against those, who rashly approached to the sacred rites, which were sanctified by men, what is to be said of him who is guilty of rashness against such and so great a mystery! For, in the same degree that he, according to the Lord's word, is greater than the temple, in the same it is more grievous and dreadful for any one, defiled with spiritual impurity, rashly to touch the body of Christ, than to approach to rams and bulls."† The same doctrine runs through the whole of S. Basil's Liturgy of the Mass, which is still used in the Churches of the East. Thus, in the consecration of the elements, the Priest calls: *τον μεν ατον τούτον, αυτο το τιμιον σωμα του Κυριου και Θεου και σωτηρος ημων, Ιησου χριστου, το δε παντηριον τούτον αυτο το τιμιον αιμα, &c.*—It will not be believed that the brother of the last quoted Father, S. Gregory of Nyssa, or his bosom friend, the renowned Divine, S. Gregory Nazianzen, differed from him, or the universal Church of his time, in this important article. Hear then what the former says: "It is now to be considered how the same body which is distributed to so many thousands of the faithful throughout the world, remains whole and entire in itself in each one of them. Therefore, I justly believe that the bread sanctified by the word of God is *transformed into the body* of the word of God.—This he bestows by the power of his blessing in that *transelemented nature* of the things that appear to us.‡ S. Gregory Nazianzen, exhorting his flock, at the Pascal Solemnity,

substantion, have subsisted for a long time wholly on the Eucharistic species.

* On Baptism, B. ii. c. 2.

† Ibid.

‡ Catechetical Discourse, c. 36. c. 37. In the last quoted words, the Father employs the word *μεταστοιχειωσιν*, which, as the learned observe, is a stronger word for the same thing than *Transubstantiation*.

tells them "To eat the body and drink the blood without hesitation or doubt, and to disregard the objections of their adversaries."* Again, in his funeral Oration on his sister Gorgonia, he says that, being afflicted with an incurable disorder, she went on a certain night into the Church, and there "falling on her knees, with faith, before the altar, she besought him, with a loud cry, who is worshipped on it," &c.

The Vicar next quotes the following words from S. Chrysostom: "If Jesus be not dead, whose symbols are they that are offered? Since therefore the word says, let us obey and believe, and look upon it with the eyes of the understanding. For what Christ delivered has nothing to do with the senses, but although joined with sensible objects, all is spiritual."† No Catholic Pastor would hesitate to use the same words in his sermon at the present day! they imply nothing more than that Christ is not visible in the Sacrament, and that though there are sensible things, the species or accidents, in it, yet that the real contents of it, which are his body, blood, soul and divinity are only present, through faith, to the eyes of the understanding on the soul. But will the Vicar, in his turn, engage to deliver from his pulpit at Templebodane, or the Castle Chaple, the following explicit testimonies of this illustrious Father, which I have selected from a great many others, no less clear? "Let us in all things believe God, and not contradict him, though what he says may seem contradictory to our sense and apprehension. His words cannot deceive us, but our senses may be easily mistaken.—Since therefore he has said **THIS IS MY BODY**, let us be convinced and believe, and behold it, with the eyes of the understanding."‡ Again: "when thou seest the body lying before thee, say: This is the same body which bled and was pierced with the lance." "Thinkest thou that thou seest bread and wine, and that these pass off, as other foods do: but far be it from thee to think so."§ He said, "**THIS IS MY BODY**: these words effect the change."|| "How far therefore ought not that person to excel every thing else in purity, who is to partake of this sacrifice! Ought not the hand which breaks this flesh, the mouth which is filled with this spiritual fire, the tongue that is empurpled with this awful blood, to be purer than the solar beams! When the Priest has invoked the Holy Ghost and perfected the dreadful sacrifice, and forthwith taken into his hands the common Lord of all things, in what rank shall we place him! What great holiness are we to expect from him! At that time the Angels surround the Priest and every choir of the Heavenly

* Second Orat. for Easter.
§ Hom. 14, on John.

† Reply, p. 165. ‡ Hom. 83. On Matt.
|| Hom. 24. On the Corinth.

Powers cries out," &c.* Should the Rev. Vicar, I say, read up these passages of S. Chrysostom in his Parish Church or the Castle Chaple, as part of his sermon, I do not know what else might befall him, but certainly they would be far from helping his promotion.

The Vicar's next witness for the Protestant doctrine is S. Jerom, where he says: "In the type of his blood he offered not water but wine:" Catholics still say the same, namely, that he did not offer the species of water, but of wine, as the type of his blood, though they continue to mix a small quantity of water with the wine, in omitting to do which, learned Protestants are conscious of abandoning Apostolical tradition: but let us hear S. Jerom, where he does not speak of types, but of the Eucharist itself. Arguing for the observance of continency, or abstinence from all carnal gratification, as a preparation for receiving the Holy Communion from the admonition of Achimelec to David, when he was desirous of eating of the loaves of proposition, 1 Kings *alias* Samuel c. xxi. v. 4, the Father says: There is as much difference between the loaves of Proposition (the holy bread which David wished to eat of, and the body of Christ), as there is between the image and the reality; between the figures of what are true, and the things which they prefigured."† Elsewhere, speaking of the Priesthood, he says, with a strength of expression that requires some explanation, "God forbid that I should speak disrespectfully of those who, succeeding to the office of the Apostles, do make the body of Christ with their sacred mouth."‡

With what frame of countenance, I should like to know, did the Vicar cite those vague words of S. Hilary: "No one is an image of himself," in proof that this Father did not believe in the Real Presence, when the following, among other testimonies to the same effect, stared him in the face: "There is no room left for doubting of the reality of the Body and Blood, since, both by the Lord's declaration and our faith, it is true flesh and blood. Is not this the truth? let those deny it to be true, who deny that Jesus Christ is true God."§

It might seem that the Vicar courted disgrace for his cause, as well as himself, when he can place the issue of it on such an equivocal passage of S. Augustine as the following: "The signs are varied, faith remaining the same: in the wilderness the Rock was Christ; to us that which is placed on the altar is Christ:" at the same time that he must know with what numberless express and unequivocal passages, in proof of the Catholic

* On the Priesthood, B. vi.

† Epist. ad Heliodor.

‡ In cap. i. Tit.

§ De Trinit. L. 8.

doctrine ; and in refutation of his own objections to it, the works of this enlightened Father abound. I shall quote a very small proportion of them. "Christ took earth from the earth (flesh being of earth,) and this flesh he took from the flesh of Mary ; and because he conversed with us in the flesh, he gave us this same flesh to eat for our salvation : but *no one eats that flesh, without adoring it first.*—We are so far from sinning by adoring it, that *we even sin if we do not adore it.*"* "As with a faithful heart and mouth we receive the Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gives us his flesh to eat and his blood to drink, although it seems more horrible to eat man's flesh than to kill it."† "Christ was carried in his own hands ; when giving his own true body, he said : *THIS IS MY BODY.*"‡ "Christ called his body meat and his blood drink : the faithful understand the Sacrament of the faithful. But there are some who do not believe ; these said to him : *this is a hard saying* : who can hear him ? It is a hard saying, but to the obdurate : it is incredible, but to the incredulous."§ "Christ said, the flesh profiteth nothing ; that is it profiteth nothing as they understood it. For they understood it to signify dead flesh, as it is sold in the markets, not as it is quickened with life."||

The Vicar must be sensible that I do not produce a tenth part of the ancient authorities that I might do ; nevertheless he taunts me with not having produced any one from Tertullian, and fancies he has got hold of strong testimonies against me, where this father says : "We ought not to offer unto God earthly, but spiritual sacrifices ;" and again : "Christ made the bread his body, by saying, *THIS IS MY BODY*, that is the *figure of my body.*"¶ To this I answer, that Tertullian is seen to be of the same sentiment with the rest of the Fathers concerning the Eucharistic Sacrament and sacrifice, by his marked distinction between the Sacrament, preserved in a box, for private communion, and ordinary bread ;** and by the extreme horror he expresses of any particle of it falling to the ground ;†† as likewise by his affirming that "our flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ,

* Ennarat. in Ps. 98.

† Lib. Contra Advers. Leg. et Proph. L. 11.

‡ Com. in Ps. 33.

§ Lib. De Verb. Apost.

|| Tract. 26. in Joan.

¶ Reply, p. 169. The Vicar, in quoting this passage, both suppresses an essential part of it and misrepresents the whole meaning of it, as I shall immediately show. The true reading of it is this : "*Corpus suum illum fecit : hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei : figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.*"

** "Non sciet Maritus quid secreto, ante omnem cibum, gustes ? Et si sciverit panem non illum credet esse quod dicitur."—*Ad Uxor L. 2.*

†† De Careg.

that our souls may be fattened with his divinity.”* With respect to the principal passage on which the Vicar builds his claim to Tertullian, and which (setting aside his mistake) is a proof that this Father held to Transubstantiation, it is plain that the Rev. Gentleman is not better versed in Tertullian’s style, which is distinguished by its *transpositions*, than he has been found to be in that of the contemporary Origen. Thus, for example, instead of saying, *Christus, id est Unctus, mortuus est*, Tertullian says: “*Christus mortuus est, id est, unctus* :”† and instead of saying, *Aperiam in parabolam, id est similitudinem, aurem meam* : this Father says ; “*Aperiam in parabolam, aurem meam, id est, similitudinem*.”‡ You have now seen (to use the Vicar’s own words) “how successful he has been in his appeal to the primitive Fathers.”§

Among the numerous and copious testimonies of the Fathers which presented themselves for quotation on the present subject, I selected those of St. Cyril, Patriarch of Jerusalem in the fourth century, and of his contemporary St. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, and Doctor of the Western Church, not so much for their dignity and sanctity, as because the treatises I quoted are familiar instructions, or catechisms, addressed to their respective flocks ; in which it is natural to expect they would express themselves plainly, and lay down the doctrine of the Church in the clearest terms possible. This they have done, especially the first-mentioned of them, to the very great displeasure and annoyance of the Vicar : indeed he loses all patience on the subject, charging me with “the most flagrant injustice to S. Cyril, in reproducing a passage from him which Ward published above a century ago in a mutilated state, after taking out of the context as much as would have determined its meaning.” He adds, that “the reproduction is the more inexcusable, as Dr. M. should have assigned some reason for following Ward’s track, after the detection and exposure of the fraud in my (the Rev. R. Grier’s) strictures on that author. I have there exhibited in its true colours his disingenuous attempt to palm on the public the passage in question, as the unbroken narrative of Cyril, after he had pared it down to suit his purpose. Nor can I now condemn in less severe terms, the artifice to which his servile imitator has had recourse.”|| Now all this indignant

* *De Resurrect. Carn.*

† *Contra Prax, c. 29.*

‡ *Contra Marcion, c. 2.*

§ Reply, p. 173.

|| Reply, p. 166. That I did not copy Ward is plain, from the difference between his translation and that which is seen in *The End of Controversy*. On the other hand, I pledge a word, which all who know the writer will believe, that I barely dipped into Mr. Grier’s *Answer to Ward*, the work which the latter refers to, but never read three continued pages in it, till

and vapouring language of the Vicar is nothing else, My Dear Sir, but mere *charlatanerie*, to take off the reader's attention from the doctrine itself of the Eastern Patriarch, which is as clearly and emphatically expressive of Transubstantiation as any to be met with in Bellarmine or S. Thomas. For, in what does this alleged *mutilation* and *paring down of the context* by Ward consist? Merely, in the latter's omission of the particle *as* in his translation of it, which, if inserted, only expresses the Catholic doctrine more clearly. S. Cyril, in the quoted passage, after repeating the whole of Christ's words of Consecration from St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23, and asking, "who will dare to disbelieve him?" And after reminding his hearers of Christ's miraculous change of water into wine, which is next to blood (*οικειον αιματι*), and then asking "how much rather ought not we to believe that he gives his body and blood to the children of the spouse?" goes on thus: "Therefore with all certainty let us receive it, *as* the body and blood of Christ: for, under the appearance of bread the body is given to you, and under the appearance of wine, the blood is given to you, that having received the body and blood of Christ, you may be of the same body and the same blood with him." Nothing can be plainer, from the whole context, than that the particle *as*, on which the Vicar lays his stress, means that the communicant is to believe *the Sacrament to be the body of Christ*, not that he is to believe it to be a *figure of it*. Ward, of course, was guilty of no fraud nor error, when he gave the passage thus: "Wherefore, full of certainty, let us receive the body and blood of Christ, &c." The other pretended fraud of Ward, to which the Vicar applies the epithets of "distorted, mutilated, jumbled, garbled, &c.," and of which he declares that it will excite the reader's astonishment,—"*as*

his present *Reply* required me to do so; being early disgusted with the empty parade of words, without argument or consistency, of which it consists, and still more with its author's want of candour, honour, and truth, as I myself sometimes experienced in my own character. I have mentioned the glaring calumny of infidelity in my quotations, respecting Arthur and Gildas, but that is trifling compared with the malevolence of his publishing a trumped-up story of my having "absolutely denounced to his Ordinary, and stigmatized as deserving the severest lash of Ecclesiastical censure," a respectable and learned Catholic clergyman in the North of England whom he names. See *Answer to Ward*, p. 128. The Vicar goes on with his libel, no one particle of which is true, as follows: "When Dr. L. heard of the intended rigours, and of the cause for which they were to be imposed, he enclosed Dr. M. some extracts from a former thesis of his, in which the same sentiments were expressed, and nearly the same words used, as those for which Dr. M. would now visit on him the vengeance of the Church!" With an equal disregard of truth, the Vicar attributes to me different books, and passages of books, with which, down to this day, I am unacquainted. During a certain period the Orangemen of Ireland attributed every new publication which they did not like to D. M.

a compound of fraud and deception not easily to be met with, except in the Jesuitical production of Dr. M. ;”* this, I say, consists of nothing more than in his having given two extracts from S. Cyril’s Catechism, one of them from the fourth, the other from the fifth article of that treatise, being both of them on the same subject of the B. Eucharist ; under a general reference to S. Cyril’s *Catechisms*, without specifying the two chapters ; at the same time that he signifies those passages do not occur in continuance, by the line of separation, which he places between them. There are several other passages in S. Cyril’s fourth lecture, equally expressive of his own and the Church’s firm belief in the corporal Presence and in Transubstantiation, beside the one already quoted : of these, I shall only adduce the Father’s concluding admonition to his hearers : “ Learning this,” he says, “ and certainly believing that what appears to be bread, is not bread ; though you perceive the taste of bread, but the body of Christ, and that, what appears to be wine, is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the blood of Christ, &c.”

In his fifth catechetical discourse, the original text of which now lies before me, S. Cyril treats chiefly of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, called the Mass ; and, as this discourse contains several points that illustrate not only the subject I have been treating of, but also others that are in debate between the Vicar and myself, I shall give some brief sketches of it.

The venerable Patriarch begins this discourse with an excellent explanation of the ceremony of the Priest’s washing his hands before he proceeds to the awful rite of Sacrifice. Next he explains the nature and import of the pax, or kiss of peace, which is still practised in the Latin Church, but later in the service. Then comes the Preface : “ the Priest crying out *αὐτὴ τὰς καρδίας* ; lift up your hearts ; to which you answer *ἔχομεν πρὸς κυρίον*, we have them to the Lord. Then the Priest says : *Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ κυρίῳ* ; let us give thanks to the Lord : to which you answer : *ἀξίον καὶ δίκαιον*. In short, the Preface concluded, as it does still, with the doxology or *ἅγιος* thrice repeated. After this we beseech the gracious God to send his Holy Spirit, in order to *make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ* *ἵνα ποιῇ τοὺς μὲν ἄρτους σῶμα χριστοῦ, τοὺς δὲ οἶνον αἷμα χριστοῦ* : for on whatever that spirit descends, it is sanctified and changed. Then when that spiritual sacrifice and that unbloody worship on the host of propitiation is completed, we beseech God for the common peace of the Church, &c. ; we pray, I say, and beseech, and we offer this sacrifice to thee, that thou wouldst remember all those who have

* Grier’s Answer to Ward, p. 123.

asleep before us, the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, that God, *through their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications*: οὕτως ὁ θεὸς εὐχαρίσῃ αὐτοὺς καὶ προσευχαίαις προσδύωσιν ἡμῶν τῇ δόξῃ. Then we pray for our deceased holy fathers and bishops, and finally for all our deceased, believing it to be a great relief to those souls, for whom the supplication of the holy and tremendous Sacrifice on the altar is offered up." Here the Patriarch solidly vindicates the practice of praying for the dead, from the objections of certain persons who opposed it. After that comes the Lord's Prayer, as it does still in our Missal, which the Father expounds at great length: coming at length to speak of the holy communion, after once more admonishing his flock not to judge of it by the taste, but rather "firmly to believe that, under the appearances, the body and blood of Christ are present," he instructs them not to spread the hand open or to separate the fingers, but to place the left hand under the right; making "a throne for so great a king, and to receive, in the hollow of the hand, the body of Christ:" as and so to receive it, as was the practice in those days.—In case this long extract, so replete with Popery in every part of it, should fall into the Vicar's hands, so far from again reproaching me with *mutilating, garbling, and paring down* the quoted catechism of the fourth century, I expect that he will alledge with De Lith, that S. Cyril *was young* when he composed it, or with another Protestant Minister, that it is a *forgery*.

With respect to the other illustrious Father, whose testimony I cited at some length, S. Ambrose, the Vicar says: "the unconnected form into which Dr. M. has thrown it (the testimony), precludes the possibility of my detecting any operation of the pruning knife, such as that performed on S. Cyril." I believe, Sir, that neither you, nor any other reader of what is stated above, will soon forget the Vicar's attempted *operation* on S. Cyril, and as to his excuse for not being able to detect an omission, which *he supposes may have taken place* in my quotation from S. Ambrose, this only shows his inability to grapple with that testimony.* He begins by referring to a different work of the Father from that cited above, in which the latter illustrates the change that takes place in the Eucharist, by that of regeneration in baptism, which, by the by, is not a figurative but a real change. Let us however hear S. Ambrose throughout in what he says concerning the B. Eucharist, in the very book here referred to. He says, "this bread is bread, before the

* P. 167. In the second passage which the Vicar here gives us from S. Ambrose, he not only garbles, but likewise materially alters the text of it, both in the Latin and the English: In the former he puts *quod est figura* for *quod est in figuram*.

words of the Sacraments; but when the consecration is added, of bread, it becomes the flesh of Christ. Let us now show how that which is bread, becomes the body of Christ. By consecration. By what words and by whose speech is consecration performed? By those of the Lord Jesus. For, as to the rest that is said (*namely, in the Mass*)* it consists of praises to God, of prayers for the people, &c.; but, when the Priest comes to perform the venerable Sacrament, he does not use his own speeches, but the speeches of Christ. Therefore the speech of Christ makes this Sacrament. Hence, to answer you: There was not the body of Christ before the consecration; but after the consecration, I tell you, there is the body of Christ." Even the translucent passage, I quoted from the Father's Book, *De Myst. Init.*† which begins with the objection, "why do you tell me that I receive the body of Christ, when I see quite another thing?" And which ends with the chief answer to it, namely: "if Christ, by his word, was able to make something out of nothing, shall he not be thought able to change one thing into another?" Even, in this passage, I say, according to the disingenuous Vicar, so far from giving "the slightest countenance to transubstantiation, is no less averse to it than the former." Perhaps then the Vicar holds that the rod of Moses was not really changed into a serpent, nor the rivers of Egypt into blood, nor the water at Cana into wine, nor the world actually created, but in *figure only*, which are the examples S. Ambrose makes use of to prove the change which takes place in the Sacrament by the words of Christ, *HOC EST CORPUS*, &c. In concluding, however, the Vicar makes the following strange concession: "The Father says nothing more nor less, than that the elements, after consecration, are endowed with *more heavenly graces*, than they had before it, but that they retain their properties unchanged."‡ Heavens! what do I hear? *Elements of bread and wine endowed with heavenly graces! Some heavenly graces, before consecration, but more heavenly graces after it!* What Catholic Father, or what Protestant Vicar, before the incumbent of Templebodanc, ever used such language, or expressed such sentiments! And how does the existence of these very graces, in whatever they may consist, agree with what this Rev. Gentleman has before told us of Christ's being present in the Sacrament, no other way than by his *ubiquity*?

* Lib. IV. De Sacramentis. S. Ambrose, in his letter to his sister Marcellina, makes express mention of his saying *Mass*; where, speaking of the violation of the Churches, he tells her: "*Ego tamen mansi in munere, Mitisam facere capi, &c.*" L. v. ep. 33.

† End of Controv., Letter xxxvii. p. 64.

‡ Reply, p. 168.

Methinks that by the time the Rev. Vicar shall have reached to this point of our controversy, he will have wished he had followed the advice of Dr. Conyers Middleton, mentioned above, instead of forming the rash "determination of depriving Dr. M. of the adventitious aid of the Fathers." Thus much I consider as certain, that there is no zealous and intelligent Protestant, who, after witnessing the contest between him and his present antagonist, will not complain of him, as Dr. Humphreys did of Bishop Jewel's extravagant challenge, that he has by his rashness "spoiled himself and his cause." I could fill up the chasm between the death of the above quoted S. Augustine, which took place before the middle of the fifth century, and that of S. Gregory the Great, at the beginning of the seventh century, with the testimonies of Fathers of the Church equally renowned for their learning and orthodoxy, equally conclusive for the doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation as those above quoted, such as a Cyril of Alexandria, a Theodoret, a Leo the Great, a Peter Chrysologus, &c. ; but I will content myself with citing a few words from the above-mentioned truly great Pope, S. Gregory, and of one or two other celebrated Doctors of the Church, connected with our own country. That holy Pope, explaining the passage in Exodus xii. 7, concerning the Pascal Lamb, and applying it to the reception of the B. Eucharist, says: "What this blood of the Lamb is, you know, not by hearing of it, but by drinking it."* In another homily he says: "The good Shepherd has laid down his life for his sheep, by changing his body and blood, in our Sacrament, and filling his sheep with the food of his flesh."† He elsewhere says: "Who can doubt that at the hour of the immolation, the heavens are opened, at the voice of the Priest, and the choirs of Angels assist at that mystery of Jesus Christ?"‡ His original biographer, John the Deacon, relates that he obtained by his prayers, that a certain lady who doubted of the real presence should see blood, instead of wine, in the chalice.§

This celebrated Pope is called *the Apostle of England*, because, being intent on the conversion of our Pagan ancestors, and detained, by force, from prosecuting his journey hither to effect it, he sent St. Augustine of Canterbury, and other holy monks, to supply his place in that pious undertaking. That they initiated their converts in the belief of Transubstantiation, as well as in the other distinguishing tenets of the Catholic Religion, is acknowledged by the learned Protestant Bishop Bale,

* Hom. 22. In Evang.

† In Evang. L. 1. Hom. 22.

‡ Dialg. L. iv. c. 58.

§ Vit. Greg. L. ii. c. 14.

the Centuriators, Dr. Humphreys and other learned Protestants, and is attested by the works of our Venerable Bede, in the eighth century, and of our learned countryman, the restorer of literature in France, Alcuin. Among other testimonies to the same purport, the former says expressly: "We believe that the true body of Christ is upon the altar, while mass is celebrated:" and again, "The bread becomes the body of Christ: *for the substance of the bread passes into the body of Christ.*"* The latter, who was in high favour with the Emperor Charlemagne, declares thus in his *Confession of Faith*, chapter iv. "By the power and the words of Christ it (the Eucharist) ever is and will be consecrated. The Priests perform the function, but Christ operates by the majesty of his divine power. He, by the power of the Paraclete Spirit and his heavenly blessing, perfects those things into his holy body and blood.—It is divided into parts, it is whole in all these parts. When manducated by all the people it remains whole and entire." It was during the reign of the above-named Emperor of the West, and while Constantine and Irene governed the East, namely, in 787, that the second General Council of Nice was held against the Iconoclasts, or Image-breakers, in which, according to the Vicar, "Transubstantiation was first introduced."† Just as if it were possible to believe that three hundred and fifty Christian Prelates from different countries, could agree together, all of a sudden, and without one dissenting voice among them, or one objection from any other Christian, or even from those Iconoclasts whom they excommunicated, in order "to advance their own credit and authority," to the impious extent that he feigns.‡ However, as the Vicar does not choose to give you the arguments and decisions of the second Council of Nice, I will here briefly give them to you. It is to be observed, that the Iconoclasts defended their heresy under the pretence that there is no other figure of Christ but the Eucharist. In opposition to this the Council declares and proves, at great length, that; Although *the* Eucharist is a figure before consecration, yet after consecration it is *The Real body and blood* of Christ, and that neither Christ nor his

* Comment in Boet. De Trinit. "Panis fit corpus Christi; transit enim substantia panis in corpus Christi." Will not the Vicar allow this, at least, to be Transubstantiation?

† Reply, p. 109.

‡ P. 110. The Vicar's words are these: "The artifice (of making all Christendom, heretics, as well as Catholics, believe in Transubstantiation) became ultimately successful: for as they blasphemously expressed it: *What* was impossible for those to do, who by uttering a few words could make God?" A blasphemy which no one ever uttered but the Vicar himself!

Apostles, nor indeed any of the Fathers ever called it a figure, (that is to say a mere figure, like an image.)*

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XI.

Pretended Rise of Transubstantiation.

DEAR SIR ;—Protestant polemics, in general, have very naturally been greatly embarrassed, when called upon by Catholic divines to assign the time when the pretended alteration of the Faith of the Church in general, and particularly with respect to the grand article of the Eucharist, took place, and to name the person or persons by whom the great Revolution, extending throughout all Christendom, was effected. At first they were shy upon the point, and some of the most learned and celebrated writers among them, as Cartwright, Powel, Whitaker, &c., denied that they were bound to answer those questions.† At present, however, it is the custom to say that Pascasius Radbert, a monk of Corby, in Germany, who wrote a book on the Sacrament, for the instruction of his novices, about the year 830, invented Transubstantiation : or, to use the words of the Vicar, gave it “a settled shape.”‡ But first, he himself has told us, in a preceding page, that the Second Council of Nice, which consisted of three hundred and fifty bishops, had “introduced it,”§ full fifty years before Pascasius wrote, and you have seen, Dear Sir, in the terms of their decision, that, they taught this dogma as clearly as the Council of Lateran or Trent did afterwards. Secondly, you have seen in the preceding quotations from the holy Fathers that they uniformly believed it and taught it ; from S. Ignatius in the Apostolic age down to our venerable Bède, who wrote at the time of the Council of Nice, and down to Alcuin, who was contemporary with Pascasius. Finally, I would ask the Vicar, or Usher himself, if he were living, to show, by what means it was possible for an obscure Monk of Saxony, to fascinate all degrees and conditions of Christians

* Ως προ του αγιασθαι εκληθη αντιτυπα, μετα δε αγιασμον σωμα κυριως και αιμα χριστου λεγονται και υψι και πιστωνται. Labbe Concil. Tom. vii. p. 450.

† “We can neither tell by whom, nor at what time, the enemy did sow your doctrine, neither are we bound to answer at what age superstition crept into the Church.” Whitaker contra Dur. Powel’s Considerat.

‡ Reply, p. 111.

§ P. 144.

from Corby to St. Thomas's on the Malabar coast, and to Axum in Ethiopia, heretics and schismatics, as well as orthodox Catholics, into the belief and worship of the corporal presence of Christ upon the altar, if they had previously believed that he is no way present as to his human nature, but only by "his divine power," and that "for any other presence it is *idolum*," it is "nothing in the world?"* Besides this, it is to be considered that within twenty-five years from the date of this Monk's treatise, the ambitious and subtle usurper of the See of C. P., Photious, contrived to divide the Greek from the Latin Church. Now, though he urged every pretext he could devise, to justify this measure, such as its fasting, and singing alleluja, at wrong times, &c., he never objected to the Western Church, its adherence to the doctrine of Pascasius. "But," says the Vicar, "that Monk proposes his opinion in the way of a paradox—and he never vaunts that his doctrine is that of the Church, and he frankly acknowledges that, before his time, men were ignorant of it."† I answer that the Vicar has let himself be woefully misled in this matter, by that false Huguenot, Claude. If he will consult the original work, he will find, in the dedication of it to King Charles the Bald, that the author asserts, "it is less his own work than that of the Catholic Fathers, whose sentiments and doctrine, (he says) I have delivered." Accordingly he quotes largely from SS. Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, Chrysostom, Jerom, Gregory, Bede, &c., for what he advances; and though he admits that "some have erred from ignorance in this matter, yet no one (he adds) has yet openly denied, *what the whole world believes and confesses*."‡

The Vicar gives up to me the writers who succeeded Pascasius during the three following centuries, in these words: "With respect to those writers who followed up the idea of the bodily presence in the Sacrament, in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, their authority, although relied upon by Dr. M., is to be disregarded, as no other sources of information were open to them, than those which we now possess."§ It would be an injustice, however, to the subject in hand, not to take notice of Berengarius, an ecclesiastic and Schoolmaster of Angers, in the middle of the eleventh century, who was the first writer either in the Latin or the Greek Church that formerly impugned the Catholic doctrine, derived from the Apostles of Christ's real transubstantiated presence in the B. Eucharist;" but as in making this daring attempt, he rose up against the whole Church, so

* P. 144.

† P. 333.

‡ "Quod totus orbis credit et confitetur." Epist. ad Frudegarum.

§ Reply, p. 153.

the whole Church may be said to have risen up against him to repress it. Almost every author of name in that age wrote against him, among whom were Hugh B. of Langres, Adelman B. of Brescia, Guitman B. of Aversa, our Lanfrank A. B. of Canterbury, Algerus Durandus, while not one writer we know of, appeared in his defence, and all the above named authors reproached the innovator with opposing the faith of the whole Christian world.* Not fewer than eleven Councils were held against his impious novelty, and as like many other heretics, when pressed, he was in the habit of verbally retracting his errors, and then republishing them in other words, some of the forms of retraction prescribed to him in these synods were drawn up in words of uncommon strength and rigour.† At length, however, when he found himself to be upon his death bed, he made a sincere retraction, and expressed sentiments worthy of a true Christian penitent, as they are reported by our faithful historian William of Malmesbury, in the words below.‡ Hence it is not surprising that he should have left no disciples to support his error. In the following, or twelfth century, a most impious and at the same time infamous heresy arose, or rather was propagated from the East, where it had been known ever since the third century, under the name of Manicheism, into the Western Church. Its partizans had many names, but they were more generally called Albigenses. Together with the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, they rejected other fundamental truths of natural, as well as revealed religion, holding, among other diabolical principles, that every sensual gratification is lawful, except that which tends to the propagation of the human species. It was against these monsters that the great Lateran Council was held, and the fires of the inquisition were lighted up. The capital error of Wickliff, who dogmatized in the fourteenth century, was, that dominion

* Lanfrank reprobates him in the following terms, "Superbia et fastu plenus, contra orbem sentire capisti—Contra Catholicam veritatem, et contra omnium Ecclesiarum opinionem scriptum condidisti." De Corp. et Sang. c. 4.

† Such is that of the Roman Council under P. Nicholas II., which the Vicar finds fault with, p. 114, by which Berenger was required to acknowledge that *the body of Christ is touched by the hands of the Priest, and broken by the teeth of the faithful*, which words, however, as Bossuet remarks, are only to be understood of the exterior species or accidents of the Sacrament, just as a man says *I am wet*, or *I am torn*, when only his clothes are wet or torn. The doctrine of the Church in this point is accurately expressed by her in the following words of the sequence in the Mass of Corpus Christi. "*Nulla rei fit scissura; signi tantum fit fractura, qua nec status nec statura, signati minuitur.*"

‡ "Hodie in die apparitionis sue (he died on the Epiphany) D. Jesus Christus apparebit mihi, propter pœnitentiam, ut spero, ad gloriam; vel propter alios, ut timeo, ad pœnam." Gul. Malm. Hist. p. 114. Ed. Savil.

is founded in grace, so that, for example, a Bishop, a Magistrate, or a King lost all his authority, if he fell into any sin ! He likewise rejected Transubstantiation, though he held to the Catholic doctrine of the corporeal presence. He also died a retractant. Huss, with his disciples, both Taborites and Calixtins, who rose at the beginning of the fifteenth century, differed in no one point from the Catholics, respecting the Eucharist, except as to the lawfulness of communicating under one kind.

At length we are arrived at the period of the Reformation, falsely so called. The author of it, Luther, who had quarrelled with the Pope for condemning his positions concerning Indulgences, was infinitely desirous, as he himself tells us, "of getting rid of the Real Presence," knowing how much this denial would have annoyed the Papacy ; "but (he added) I found myself caught, the words of Scripture being too strong against me."* He therefore satisfied himself with substituting Consubstantiation to Transubstantiation ; that is to say, the real presence of the bread, and the Real Presence of Christ's body, united together, in one person, Christ our Lord. His followers, however, subdivided themselves, as might be expected, into many different sects, in explaining this doctrine, and these divisions, on the article of the Eucharist, became too numerous to be counted up, when Carlostat, and Zuinglius, and Calvin, and Bucer, and other leaders renounced the Real Presence, and published their different systems of the Sacrament, in defiance of their master Luther, who, as I have already said, "employed sometimes the shafts of his coarse ridicule, and sometimes the thunder of his vehement declamation and anathemas against them."† Cranmer, who, as all writers agree,‡ had the greatest hand, if not the only hand, in drawing up the Liturgy of the Church of England, was at first a Lutheran, having sucked in the doctrine of Osiander, whose sister he married while he resided in Germany. Accordingly, his first edition of that liturgy, which was sanctioned by Parliament in 1547, at the beginning of young Edward's reign, and even declared, in its Act, to have been "concluded upon *by the aid of the Holy Ghost*,"§ expressed the doctrine of the Real Presence. In short it was the Mass

* Epist. ad Argentin. Tom. iv. fol. 522, Ed. Witten.

† "The devil seems to have mocked those to whom he has suggested a heresy so ridiculous and contrary to Scripture, as that of the Zuinglians."—He elsewhere calls these deniers of the corporal presence, "a damned Sect, lying heretics, bread breakers, wine drinkers and soul-destroyers, indeivilized and superdevilized." See End of Controv. Letter xxxvii. p. 66, and Letters to a Prebendary.

‡ Heylin, Burnet, Dr. Tomline, &c.

§ Burnet. Hist. of Ref. P. ii. p. 93.

itself, with a few alterations. But as that versatile Archbishop never had any other principle either of Religion or of Politics, but the will of the ruling power, and as the Protector Somerset had, by his correspondence with Calvin, combined with motives of self interest, imbibed much of the latter's doctrine and spirit,* he readily went over to the system of the *Figurative Presence*, which, accordingly, he expressed in the new Liturgy of that reign, sanctioned by Parliament in 1552, and in the twenty-ninth of the forty-two Articles of the same date. But, whereas Elizabeth, from principle as well as from policy, leaned to the Catholic doctrine and discipline in the article of the Eucharist, as well as in several other articles, she took care that the Rubrick of Edward's second Liturgy, which declares that, *It is against the truth of Christ, that his natural body should, at one time, be in more places than one*, should be expunged out of the liturgy, and that the corresponding article should be softened down to its present consistency. So the liturgy remained for a hundred years, till upon the Restoration, the expunged Rubrick above mentioned was again restored. Let us now hear the Rev. Vicar's account of these matters, by way of proving that all these changes were no change at all, but only stages of "successive improvement—each one of which brought the whole nearer to the state of perfection for which (he says) we so justly admire it." "It is granted (by the Vicar) that our first liturgy, in 1548, expressed, as might naturally be expected, the Popish idea of the Real Presence. But, in its next revision, in 1552, a Rubrick was added denying this tenet. Queen Elizabeth, however, who had not yet imbibed the pure spirit of Christianity,—expunged it in 1559, her design being to unite the nation in one faith. The *contrivance* had the desired effect, as the Popish laity continued in connexion with the Church of England for ten years.—In 1661 the old anti-popish Rubrick was restored. These stages mark the successive improvement (of the Liturgy!)" Here are four different changes in the articles of the Eucharist, namely, from Popery to Protestantism, then back to Popery, and lastly once more to Protestantism: and yet, according to the Vicar, there was *no change at all!* And what is most extraordinary, the changes to Popery are, according to the Vicar's account, no less *successive improvements* than those to Protestantism are! I say nothing of Elizabeth's "*contrivance*," which the Vicar speaks of with approbation, for tripping the Catholics out of their Religion, by making them believe, that the Established Church in its liturgy and articles, admits of the Corporal presence and Transubstantiation, except

* P. 142.

to express a stronger detestation of fraud than of force, in every attempt to procure conformity with the State Religion. Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign I read of fifty-three Catholic Gentlemen, who were prisoners in York Castle, merely for refusing to attend the established service, being dragged by main force into the Castle Chapel every Sunday, for a year together, to hear that service :* but did this make Church-Protestants of them? The same question may be asked the Rev. Mr. Grier and the Bishop of St. David's, who both allege the fact in question, with respect to those among the Catholics who, at the beginning of the same reign, went to their Parish Churches on Sundays, to avoid the fines and imprisonment consequent on their recusancy. Did this occasional conformity make them good Churchmen, while they were careful to hear mass at their own houses beforehand, as I have proved to have been their custom? No doubt they acted wrong in this their compliance, and accordingly they desisted from it, when they were so instructed by a committee of the Council of Trent.

I have not yet noticed the exceptions which the Vicar takes, to my quotations from and references to certain Protestant Bishops and Divines, who either acquit the Catholics of Idolatry, in worshipping the B. Sacrament, or who themselves maintained Christ's Real Presence in it. With respect to these writers in general, I have again to remark that if they wrote or acted inconsistently, it is not my business, nor did I ever undertake to reconcile them with themselves. It is enough for me that they made the concessions : I quote from them ; had they throughout supported the Catholic doctrines, they would have been Catholics, not Protestants, and could not have kept their livings. Thus, for example, I cited Gunning, Bishop of Ely, who, when the *Declaration against Popery* was brought into the House of Lords, protested he could not swear that Catholics are Idolaters. The Vicar is forced to confess the fact,† but says that the Bishop by taking the Oath, after the Act, enjoining it, had passed, "sealed his conviction" that they are Idolaters. This would prove that all our legislators, who make the declaration at the present day, believe Catholics to be Idolaters, contrary to their own public testimony. With respect to Gunning it only proves that he could not afford to part with his Bishopric. I will add nothing more to what I have said concerning Bishop Taylor, except that no English Protestant, who is zealous for the credit of his Church, ought ever to mention his name without an apology for so doing. As to Bishop Cozin,

* Mem. of Mission. Priests, vol. i. p. 429.

† Reply, p. 131.

the Vicar is forced to acknowledge that he says all I have quoted from him, which is to say, all that completely overturns his (the Vicar's) definitions of the Sacrament. If it were necessary to prove that the other Protestant Bishops, Laud, Andrews and Bramhall, held the doctrine of the Real Presence, the only article for which I cited them, the Vicar has done this to my hand in the passages he has cited from them. All then that I shall add, on the subject is, that if the Vicar had lived in their time, and had reduced the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, as he does in his *Reply*, to mere *ubiquity*, which implies that he is no otherwise present in it, than he is in every other piece of bread, or than he is in a Pagan idol, they would have unanimously exclaimed with Bishop Cozin : "We ought not to suffer such an one in our Church." In conclusion, the Vicar is reduced to the Jewish objections, drawn from the senses, all which I have refuted by sound arguments of metaphysics and physics, as well as by the Scriptures and the Ancient Fathers. He admits that each of the senses may separately deceive us : "But," says he, "let Dr. M. furnish us with an instance where both sight and touch have, at the same time, been so imposed upon."* And yet, strange to tell, but two lines before this challenge, he himself mentioned an instance which I had quoted, in which not only the sight and the touch, but the hearing also were deceived ; namely, when Jacob wrestled and conversed with an angel. Gen. xxxii. 24. In a word, my antagonist is at last constrained to admit ; that "Christ's power to perform the miracle spoken of (that of changing bread into his body) is unquestioned?"† Here then all his own and Tillotson's objections, drawn from the senses, fall to the ground, and Transubstantiation is allowed to be possible. Full of faith then, as I know that you and your fellow converts are, that this great mystery is not only possible, but also that it actually takes place in our awful sacrifice, you will not fail to reject all such objections to it as the Jews made of old, when they said : *How can he give us his flesh? This is a hard saying ; who can hear it?* by addressing yourselves to the Divine institutor of it, in the words of St. Peter : *Lord to whom shall we go ! Thou hast the words of Eternal life.* John vi. 69.

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* P. 182.

† P. 168.

LETTER XII.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

DEAR SIR ;—It is shown in *The End of Religious Controversy*, that no Religious system, true or false, Patriarchal or Mosaic, Christian or Pagan, Orthodox or Heretical, ever existed, without that Supreme Act of Religion, called SACRIFICE, until within these three centuries ; that Martin Luther let himself be persuaded by Satan, as he himself acquaints us in great detail, to declare himself against it.* Abel, Noah, Job, Melchisedec, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, in short all the Patriarchs offered Sacrifice, down to the divine mission of Moses, a great part of whose law related to the different species and rites of Sacrifice. These several Sacrifices continued to be offered up during the time of the Prophets down to the last of them, Malachy, who announced the Almighty's approaching rejection of the Jewish Sacrifices, and his substitution in their place of *a sacrifice and pure oblation*, which should be *offered up in every place among the Gentiles, from the rising of the sun to the setting thereof*,† which prophecy has been visibly fulfilled since the promulgation of the Gospel, in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass throughout the Christian World, and in no other way. In like manner among the characters of the promised Messiah, foretold of him by the Psalmist, and declared by the Apostle to have been fulfilled in our Saviour, Christ, his Priesthood, according to the order of Melchisedec, is emphatically dwelt upon. Absorbed in the contemplation of this Divine Personage, Holy David exclaimed respecting him : *The Lord hath sworn and he will not repent (of it.) Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec* ;‡ and St. Paul wrote so copiously and sublimely, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, concerning him ; where, among other things, he proves the superior dignity of Christ's Priesthood, according to the order of Melchisedec, as follows : *If perfection was by the Levitical Priesthood, what further need was there that another Priest should rise according to the order of Melchisedec, and not be called according to the order of Aaron* ?§ Now, in what did the Priesthood of Melchisedec differ from that of the Levitical Priesthood ? We learn this from the short history of that Patriarch in the book of Genesis ; namely, that when Abraham returned from his victory in the vale of Save, Melchisedec, the King of Salem, *bringing forth bread*

* Letter ix.

‡ Ps. 109, alias 110.

† Malac. i. 2.

§ Heb. vii. 11.

and wine, for he was the Priest of the Most High God, blessed him.* It was then in offering bread and wine, the types and elements of the Sacrifice of the new law, which Christ was to institute, that the superiority of his sacrifice consisted. Such is the sense of Scripture in the passages here quoted, to an upright mind, and so they have been explained by SS. Justin, Ireneus, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and the Fathers in general. I have already quoted some of these holy witnesses of the *Faith once delivered to the Saints*,† in this matter of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, some part of whose testimony I will once more repeat in the note below.‡ Nevertheless, the Vicar, just as if those texts of Holy Writ and those passages from the Fathers had never been cited, or did not mean what they so clearly express, has the confidence to say: "The Scriptures do not warrant our calling it a *Sacrifice*, nor do the records of the primitive church furnish us with any document for considering it one." In fact, if the Fathers thought it such, they would have called it so."§ You see, My Dear Sir, and the Vicar must have seen, that each one of the three first-mentioned Fathers, SS. Justin, Ireneus, and Cyprian, not only prove that there is a real Sacrifice of the New Law, but also that they expressly call it by the name of SACRIFICE. What then can I term the above-quoted assertion of the Rev. Gentleman, but an impugning of the known truth? But, I will here add a few more testimonies of the Fathers to those already adduced, in proof that they both *considered* the principal liturgy of the Church as a *Sacrifice*, and that they were accustomed to *call it so*. S. Augustin expounded that verse of the thirty-ninth, alias the fortieth Psalm, *Sacrifice and oblation thou dost not desire*, says thus, "Are we then to be without Sacrifice? God forbid. Let us then hear: *But thou hast formed a body for me*. Here is a new victim. What then is it that God will reject?—The figures.—What is it that God will accept of and prescribe to fulfil the figures?—The body that fulfils all the figures, *the adorable body of Jesus Christ, upon our altars*."|| The same H. Father, among numerous other testimonies to the same effect, writes as follows: "This Sacrifice succeeds to all the Sacrifices of the Old law, which were immolated, as shadows of that which was to come. In place of all

* Gen. xiv. 18.

† Jud. i. 3.

‡ S. Justin writes: "Christ instituted a *Sacrifice* in bread and wine which Christians offer up in every place." Quoting Malachy, Dialog. with Tryphon, S. Ireneus writes: "Christ in consecrating bread and wine has instituted the *Sacrifice* of the New Law, which the Church has received from the Apostles; quoting Malachy. i. iv. 32, S. Cyprian calls the Eucharist "a true and full sacrifice;" adding, that "as Melchisedec offered bread and wine, so Christ offered the same, namely, his body and blood." Epist. 68.

§ Reply, p. 241.

|| S. Aug. in. Ps. 39.

those sacrifices and oblations, his body is offered and administered to the partakers of it.”* S. Ambrose writes: “We offer Sacrifice for the people: and however imperfect we are of ourselves, we are truly ennobled by this Priesthood.”† This Father, like S. Cyril, whom I quoted in a former letter, cites largely from the Canon of the Mass, and expressly calls the B. Eucharist “*an unbloody victim*.” The General Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon equally call it so.”‡ I might fill a folio with documents to the same effect, but will content myself in conclusion, with giving you and your fellow converts a word from the great S. Chrysostom, on the precise point of the *Eucharistic Sacrifice*; what I cited in a former letter from him regarding particularly the *Real Presence*. “Christ prepared a more wonderful and magnificent Sacrifice for us, when he changed the Sacrifice, and instead of slaughtered beasts gave himself to be offered up.”§ My argument leading me to expose the inconsistent claims of certain Protestant divines in this matter,|| the Vicar undertakes to justify their claims, and to place his Liturgy in competition with the Catholic Sacrifice of the Mass, in the following manner. He says: “The Eucharist is a Sacrifice in a figurative sense, as when we call it a *Sacrifice of praise*. It is also a *feast upon a Sacrifice*, at which we profess our belief in the death of Christ.—The table of the Lord is an *Altar*, on which is offered the *type* of the Sacrifice of Christ himself,—while they, who serve at it, discharging the *priestly functions* of consecration and absolution, are properly called *Priests*.”¶ But what froth, My Dear Sir, is all this, to conceal the want of real substance! What an assemblage of words approaching to the language of Scripture and the Fathers, while their real meaning is as distant from it as East is from West! The Vicar’s Eucharist, then, according to him, is a *Sacrifice*, because it *represents* Christ! though not by any means so significantly as did the Pascal lamb of old. It is a *Sacrifice of Praise*! Why so are the Psalms and other good prayers. It is a *feast on a Sacrifice*! though there is neither any spiritual food nor any victim present, except God’s general ubiquity. The Table is an altar, because the *type* of Christ is placed upon

* De Civit Dei. L. xvii. c. 20.

† In Ps. 38.

‡ Ephes. in its declarat. on the 11th Anath. Chalced. Art. 3.—Among other ancient witnesses, I might here adduce Tertullian, whom the Vicar introduced as denying the existence of real sacrifice under the New Law: nevertheless, this Father expressly says, “We offer up Sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor.” L. ii. ad Scap. c. 1, and in his book De Cult. Famin. c. 7., he restrains women from going out into public, except to attend the sick, or hear the word of God, or “when the *Sacrifice* is offered.”

§ Hom. 14. 1. Cor.

|| End of Controv. Letter xl.

¶ Reply, p. 240.

it! Thus every table is an altar, which supports a Crucifix or book of the Gospels. Finally, the Vicar himself is a Priest, because he pronounces the consecration and absolution! Though, in doing this, according to his own explanation, he performs nothing more than what his clerk, or any other man or woman in his parish, could perform, as well as himself. Is such, then, the *Sacrifice and pure oblation*, according to Malachy, that was to render the name of God *great among the Gentiles*? Is such the grand rite, for instituting which the Almighty swore that his Incarnate Son should be a *Priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedec*? Is this *the true and full Sacrifice*, of which S. Cyprian speaks? In a word: will the Vicar himself pretend to reconcile his "*figurative Sacrifice*," and his "types of Christ's death," &c., with the above quoted positive declarations of S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, and the other Fathers, that the reality of Christ's body and blood is now substituted to the former figures of it?

The only attempt of the Vicar to argue on the present point is contained in the following passage, which I give in all its native deformity. He says: "Besides the idolatry and sacrilege, to which Transubstantiation gave birth, may be added the gross impiety which arose out of it, in the sacrifice of the Mass; by which the sufficiency of our Saviour's Sacrifice, once offered, is *roundly denied*. For, according to it, the Church of Rome considered the Lord's Supper both as a memorial of Christ's death, and as a Sacrifice actually offered up to God, and that it is not only commemorative, but propitiatory, both for the living and the dead."* In the first place, Sir, I should be glad to ask the Vicar what Catholic ever *roundly denied* the sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice on the cross, or insinuated the slightest doubt concerning it? So far from this being the case, it is an article of our faith, that the slightest atonement of an Incarnate God is sufficient to wash away the sins of all mankind from Adam to Antichrist. In the second place, I would require a proof from him that this consequence follows from the doctrine of the reality of the Sacrifice of the Mass? On this point it is evident that the Vicar stands in need of information. You know, My Dear Sir, and he ought to have known before he undertook to treat of this matter, that the sacrifice of the Cross, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, are not distinct from each other, but are *one and the same Sacrifice*: the *victim* is the same, the *Priest* is the same, the *objects* are the same, namely, glory to God, mercy, grace, and salvation to men. The sole difference is as to the manner of offering. On the Cross, Christ's blood was actually

* Reply, p. 239.

shed ; but, though he is as truly present, both as to body and soul, in the Mass as he was on the Cross, his blood is only separated from his body *mystically*, and by *representation*. It is an error to suppose that the repetition of the Sacrifice, any more than of prayers, implies any thing to be wanting to its intrinsic perfection or efficacy ; since otherwise Christ would not command us *to pray* to our all-bountiful Father *always and without fainting*.* But the bright light of the Eastern Church, S. John Chrysostom, will refute the Vicar's error, and illustrate this whole matter, far better than I can do. His words are these and S. Ambrose speaks to the same effect : " Whether Peter, Paul, or any other Priest of inferior merit, presents the sacred oblation, it is the same which Christ delivered to his disciples, and which the Priests now perform. The latter possesses nothing less than the former. Why so ? Because they are not men, but Christ, who had before consecrated it. For as the words that Christ spoke are the same that the Priests now pronounce, so the oblation is the same."† He elsewhere says : " We always offer the same thing, not one lamb to-day and another to-morrow, but always the same lamb. Hence the Sacrifice is always the same : Otherwise, as it is offered in many places, there would be many Christs : but this is not so : but there is one Christ everywhere ; and being entire, here and there, he is one and the same body. For as he who is offered is one body and not many bodies, so *there is but one Sacrifice*. For our High Priest is *he who offered the victim, that cleansed us : this we offer now*."‡

I cannot leave this subject of the Sacrifice of the Mass, without mentioning one or two omissions of the Vicar to fulfil his engagement of answering all my principal arguments ; which omissions I think he would not have been guilty of, if he had known what to say on those heads. I complained then, that not only B. Porteus, but also the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Hey, and most Protestant Divines,§ incessantly talk of and declaim against what they call *The Popish Mass* ; whereas they cannot be ignorant that the same liturgy is performed, and the same belief of its being a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, grounded on *transubstantiation*, is held by all Christians throughout the world, except the comparatively few who inhabit the British Islands, Denmark, Sweden, and certain parts of Germany. I speak of the Greeks, the Russians, the Nestorians, the Euty-chians, the Cophs, the Ethiopians, &c. ; all these millions of Christians, I say, believe in, and offer up the *real Sacrifice of*

* Luke xviii. 1.

† Hom. 17. on Heb.

‡ Hom. II. on 2d to Tim.

§ End of Controv., Letter xl.

the Mass, no less than Catholics do.* What means, then, the term of *Popish Mass*, objected to the latter, unless for the purpose of invidious obloquy? In like manner, what sense is there in requiring Members of Parliament to swear that "*The Mass, AS IT IS USED BY THE CHURCH OF ROME, is idolatrous,*" when all the above named millions of Christians use it and believe in it, just as she does?

In another important point of the present question, I find the Vicar equally wanting to his promise of answering all my principal arguments. You recollect, Dear Sir, my stating that Luther was the first innovator who formally attacked the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that he was induced so to do by the arguments of Satan, who held a midnight conference with him of more than an hour's length on the subject. It is Luther himself who relates the history, and publishes in full detail the five theological arguments the Devil made use of for this purpose. Surely this was a matter worthy the Vicar's attention. He should have told us whether or no he subscribes to the five notable arguments of the infernal theologian against the Mass, which, after all, display much more learning and talent than his own chapter on that subject. If he does admit them, he owns no less than Luther, who is his original preceptor in this matter. If he rejects them, he ought to furnish some better arguments than Satan does, for coming to the same conclusion with him. In the mean time it is an undeniable fact that Satan's arguments against the Mass published by Luther, tom. vii. p. 228, form the earliest treatise extant in support of that impiety.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XIII.

Communion under one Kind.

DEAR SIR:—Instructed as you are in the doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament; I am aware that nothing can sound more extraordinary in your ears than complaints and reproaches against the Catholic Church, as having "sacrilegiously taken away half of that Sacrament," on the part of persons who themselves have taken away the whole of it! Christ being whole and entire, as to his body, his blood, his soul, and his divinity, in the Blessed Eucharist, and under each species of it, you know that the

* See this proved in detail by Le Brun, in his *Explication de la Messe*,

faithful equally receive Christ whole and entire, whether they receive him under the form of bread, or under the form of wine, whether under one kind or under both; whereas the Vicar, with the Prelates whom he quotes, acknowledging no Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, except as to the *ubiquity* of his Divine nature, and no participation of Christ except by "an act of the mind;"* it is evident that, in this supposition, the whole Sacrament is destroyed, and nothing but an imagination of eating, and a mere ideal food, is left in place of the reality which Catholics receive.

The fundamental doctrine of Christ's real and corporal presence in the B. Sacrament having been clearly proved from Scripture, the Fathers, the testimony of the infallible Church, and even from that of all heretics and schismatics, till within the three last centuries: in like manner it having been clearly proved that, after those *words of Christ*, of which you have heard the ancient Fathers speak such great things, namely, the words of consecration, *there is no bread nor wine*, but only the *species* or *accidents*, as they are called, left in the Sacrament, and that Christ, whole and entire, exists in their place; it is an evident consequence that the *mode of receiving* him in this sacrament is merely accidental and immaterial, as far as regards the effect of it. Hence the person who receives under the form of bread, receives exactly the same as another does who receives under the form of wine, and he who receives under both kinds, receives nothing more than he who receives under either kind: for he can receive nothing more than Jesus Christ whole and entire. Hence it follows, likewise, from the nature of the thing itself, as well as from the tradition and the declarations of the Church, that the point in question, namely, the manner of receiving Christ in the B. Sacrament, whether under one or both kinds, is a matter of variable discipline, to be regulated by the Church, according to existing circumstances. The End of Controversy shows that very many things relating to the Sacraments, both of Baptism and the B. Eucharist, are and must be determined by the tradition of the Church.† From this we learn, that though Christ instituted the latter Sacrament, after washing the feet of his Apostles in azyme or unleavened bread, at supper, after eating a Pascal lamb, the whole company being in a recumbent posture, yet that none of these circumstances regards the essence of the Sacrament, or is obligatory on Christians at present. It is this same tradition which informs us, that the mode of receiving Christ in the B. Eucharist, whether under this or under that kind, whether under one kind

* Reply, p. 143.

† Letter xxxix,

or under both, is, of its own nature, indifferent, and to be determined, at all times, by the Church, as in fact it always has been so determined by her: this explanation causes the Vicar to run into a long and very inconsistent dissertation on the subject of tradition, in which, following Dr. Marsh, he admits of a *tradition of ceremonies*, things variable according to times and places, and rejects the *tradition of doctrine*, which must be in all times and places invariable. But to confine myself to the present point: the Vicar denies that the Church of England has been guided by the tradition of any Church whatever respecting the circumstances of it, and maintains that "it uses its own discretion concerning them. "It retains (he says) what is *essential to the Sacrament*, while it has wisely omitted such circumstances as would be useless, inconvenient, or impossible to be complied with. It performs the Sacramental action, in the way commanded by Christ, when he said: DO THIS, by *blessing bread and eating it*, by *blessing wine and drinking it*, in remembrance of him. *In this consists the essence of the Sacrament of the Eucharist*; and to the punctual observance of it the Church of England is scrupulously attentive; while it omits circumstances in themselves indifferent, such as the washing of feet, the time, place, and manner of receiving."*

Without stopping, Dear Sir, to show you how the Vicar here *begs the question*, by assuming that his Church *retains what is essential* to the Sacrament, or to expose the absurdities implied by his definition of the *essential part* of it, I proceed to inquire into the truth of what he here and elsewhere so confidently asserts, that this Church *used its discretion* in adopting this and the other changes which took place in the ancient Religion. His account of these changes would lead an ignorant person to suppose that a national synod was held upon the business, at least that the Bishops and Clergy, after deep study and mutual conferences, had come to unanimous resolutions concerning it: whereas, in fact, the whole of it was carried on at the different periods of its progress by the mere act and will of the ruling power in the state, not only without their being consulted about it, but, generally speaking, in direct opposition to their judgment and decision. The sensual tyrant Henry struck the first blow by abrogating the Pope's spiritual power, and requiring his Bishops and Clergy to swear that he himself was THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH. In vain did they petition him to be allowed to annex this condition to their oath of his spiritual supremacy: *as far as is allowable by the law of God.*† Armed with this irresistible weapon of the supremacy, the uncle and protector of

* Reply, p. 192.

† "In quantum per Christi licet." Mat. Parker, Antiq. Britan. p. 325.

the Royal youth, Edward VI., who was then only nine years of age, Seymour, Duke of Somerset, proceeded to make whatever changes of the national religion which suited his avarice and ambition, by means of Injunctions and Royal Visitations which he in the King's name, set on foot, and to which the Bishops and Clergy were as much subjected as the meanest layman. Some of the former he imprisoned for disobedience to this his spiritual Supremacy, and one of them he sent to the Fleet Gaol, for refusing to preach a sermon, the heads of which he sent him for that purpose.* In the mean time the second order of the Clergy petitioned, to no purpose, that "no law might pass concerning the Christian Religion, &c. without their privity."† In short, says Fuller, "He (Somerset) ordered all things in Church and State."‡ Having soon after, by the agency of Sir Ralph Sadler, packed a Parliament for his purposes,§ he made it his tool in the different and sometimes opposite Religious changes that it suited him to make.|| One of the first acts of this servile assembly was to ordain that the Sacrament should be administered in both kinds; which being done, Somerset issued a Proclamation, in the name of the Royal child, which enjoined obedience, not only on this point, but also in general, that "The Sacrament (he says) be ministered unto our people only after such form and manner as hereafter, *by our authority*, is set forth." He concludes: "We would not have our subjects so much to mislike our judgment, or so much to mistrust our zeal, as though we could not discern what were to be done, &c."¶ Such was the Vicar's boasted *discretion* of his Church, with respect to the choice of its rites and forms in the administration of the Sacraments. No doubt there was a Churchman of the highest rank, the unhappy Cranmer, who was Somerset's tool in all these changes; but then he was *nothing else but a tool*, in this and every other measure, religious as well as political, of the varying times in which he lived. We are possessed of his formal declaration, that a Bishop is nothing else but the King's officer, to obey his orders in all ecclesiastical matters, just as a state officer is in those of a civil nature,** in conformity with which declaration, on the death of Henry, he took out a fresh commission to exercise the office of Archbishop of

* Burnet. Rec. P. ii., N. 28. Colliers's Ch. Hist. p. 250.

† Burnet's Records, P. ii. N. 17.

‡ Ch. Hist. b. vii. p. 372.

§ Heylin's Hist. Ref. p. 47.

|| Heylin complains heavily of the interference of Calvin with the English Church, by his letters to the Protector. This led to a further Reformation, as it was called, and quite a different Liturgy, in 1550, from that of 1548, in framing both which Cranmer was almost solely employed.

¶ B. Sparrow's Collect. p. 17.

** Collier's Hist. Records, ex. MSS. Stillingf. p. 48.

Canterbury, from the child Edward, or rather from his uncle Somerset, during his good pleasure ;* and the whole tenor of his life, from his first appearance at Cambridge till his melancholy death at Oxford, was conducted on that time-serving principle.† Nor was the case dissimilar at the second establish-

* Burnett's Hist. Records, P. ii. N. 2.

† Archbishop Cranmer having been the principal author of the Articles, the Liturgy and the Reformation, as it is called, of the Church of England, and his memory being immoderately extolled by the Vicar on this account, it is proper to take the following facts into consideration for forming a true judgment of him. He first rose to notice, while a student at Cambridge, by declaring for the divorce of Queen Catharine, and suggesting that, to promote this, the opinion of different Universities should be procured on the point, *whether a marriage with a brother's widow is not contrary to the law of God?* This suggestion made his worldly fortune: Henry followed it up by sending to different Universities his Envoys and his *Angels* (*pieces of money so called*) swearing at the same time, that "Cranmer had got the right sow by the ear." Going himself into Germany, on the Divorce business, Cranmer there became a Lutheran, and took for his second wife Osiander's sister, whom, however, being a Priest, and the law of celibacy still existing in England, he could not bring into it but as a smuggled article, and therefore stowed her in a large box. In 1532 he was named by Henry to the see of Canterbury, and, at his consecration said Mass, and swore obedience to the Pope, in direct opposition to his religious principles. In like manner, he signed Henry's Six Articles against Protestantism, obliging his clergy to do the same, and to vow celibacy, when any of them were ordained, though he never observed it, nor believed in the Articles himself. He even published books in defence of Transubstantiation, and persecuted the Protestants who denied it, even to the extremity of death at the stake, during the whole life-time of his Royal master. On the 14th of November, 1532, he assisted as a witness at the marriage of the King with Ann Boleyn; and on the 11th of the following March, he wrote a formal letter to the former, moved thereto, as he declared, "by pure motives of conscience," in which he represented the necessity there was of terminating the long pending cause between him and his Queen, and demanded of him the necessary *spiritual power* to pronounce upon it. Having obtained a commission to this effect, on the 20th of May, he issued a sentence of divorce between the King and the Queen, authorising the King to marry again, six months after he had witnessed his marriage with Ann Boleyn, and not four months before the latter was delivered of an infant, who became the famous Queen Elizabeth! The tyrant, growing jealous or weary of his bride, Cranmer acted the infamous part of extorting from her a confession of what he had before proved to be false, namely, that she had never been validly married to Henry, on account of a pre-contract, and this, at the very time when she was lying under sentence of death for *adultery*, in his regard!—Burnet, Collier, &c. The King's fourth wife was Ann of Cleves, concerning whom, as there was some question of her being under a pre-contract, Cranmer was formally commissioned to enquire into it, when he formally pronounced that no such contract existed. However, as the King, within six months, became disgusted with this his foreign wife, Cranmer was again commissioned to examine the business, when, in compliance with the tyrant's will, he decided that the contract was valid, and that the King was free to take a fifth wife! On the death of Henry, he concurred as an executor, in setting aside the greater part of his will, and became as abject a tool to the ambition and avarice of Somerset, as he had been to the lust of

ment of Protestantism by Elizabeth. She began with turning all the Bishops and most respectable Clergymen out of their places; and if she allowed their successors to deliberate about the doctrines and rites of Religion, she claimed and exercised the absolute authority in revising and correcting their determinations. We have, in Burnet's Exposition of the Articles, a catalogue of alterations which she made even in these, after they had been discussed and resolved upon by the Convocation. Finally, the Vicar himself gives up Elizabeth's Reformation, on the very point under consideration, where he says that: "She had not yet imbibed the pure spirit of Christianity which had guided her youthful predecessor and the venerable Cranmer."*

Bent, however, on blackening the fair spouse of Christ, the Vicar represents one of her General Councils, that of Constance, as "openly opposing its authority to that of the Divine Founder of the Institution." It set out (he says) with acknowledging that Christ instituted and administered the B. Sacrament to his disciples in both kinds, and that, in the primitive Church, the faithful received it in both kinds; yet, a practice being reasonably introduced, to avoid some dangers and scandals they (the Catholic Bishops) appoint the custom of consecrating in both kinds, and of giving it to the laity only in one kind, since Christ is

Henry. To gratify these, he subscribed the death warrant of his brother, Thomas Seymour, the Lord Admiral, who was a mere victim of political intrigue, though he, Cranmer, was exempt, by his ecclesiastical character, from the necessity of concurring in such a sanguinary sentence; and with equal pliancy, when Dudley, Earl of Warwick, gained the mastery, he set his hand to the warrant that consigned Somerset himself to the block! He even took a principal part in the treason of abrogating the eventual right of King Henry's children, Mary and Elizabeth, to the Crown, and transferring it to Dudley's son and daughter-in-law, Lady Jane. As he had, in Henry's reign, brought John Lambert, Ann Askew, John Frith, William Allen, and other Protestants to the stake for denying the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, so he manifested the same intolerance with regard to other Protestants whose ideas of the Reformation went further than his own, during the reign of Edward. He even constrained the Royal child Edward, in spite of his tears and expostulations, to sign the death warrant of Jane Knell, a harmless visionary, and George Van Parr, an Anabaptist, who were burnt at the stake. Early in this reign, he had himself sung a High Mass of Requiem for the soul of the deceased French King, than which nothing could be more contrary to his professed doctrine; and even, after the death of Edward, he offered to do the same for the soul of the latter, to please Queen Mary, which was a complete revocation of his Forty-two Articles and Second Liturgy. Being brought to his trial for treason and heresy, he signed six different forms of recanting the whole Protestant Religion, each stronger than the preceding one, at the same number of times, during the last two months of his life, and thus was, until within an hour of his death, either a sincere Catholic, or an egregious hypocrite! *Strype's Mem. Eccl.* Vol. iii. p. 234.

* Reply, p. 142.

truly and entire under each kind.”* Had not the Vicar fraudulently suppressed the first words of the Decree, his mouth would have been shut, and he could not have quoted any part of it against us Catholics, as his own doctrine and practice would have *appeared* to be no less opposite to the divine institution, than he represents ours to be. In fact, the first decision in this decree is, that though Christ instituted “the Sacrament, *after supper*, yet that this is no reason why *we should not receive it fasting*,” a conclusion in which Protestants are forced to join us.† Nay, we have just now heard the Vicar himself setting up a general claim, for his Church, of “using its own discretion” with respect to the sacramental ceremonies, and of “omitting such circumstances as (*it judges*) would be useless, inconvenient, or impossible,” such as the use of unleavened bread, which it is unquestionable Christ made use of at the Last Supper, and the washing of feet, which he seems to have so strictly enjoined.‡ The only difference between the Churches is, that the Church of England, according to the Vicar’s account, *disclaims* the light and authority of tradition, in choosing what ordinances and ceremonies it will omit and retain; while the Catholic Church always professes to be guided by that light and authority. Thus, to confine myself to the point before us, the Catholic Church knows, and has always known, that the B. Eucharist is a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament; that as a *Sacrifice*, it must necessarily be consecrated in both kinds, to represent his death; but that as a *Sacrament*, the whole body and blood of Christ being as much contained under one kind as under both, it belongs to her to determine, according to circumstances, in which of these ways Christ shall be received by the faithful. Had the Vicar and his Lordship of Durham attended to the doctrine and conduct of the Oriental Churches, which retain the double communion, with respect to the discipline of the Catholic Church in this matter, or even to the Legislative Act of this kingdom, which first prescribed the general use of the Sacrament under both kinds, they would certainly have abstained from the epithets of *Impious* and *Sacrilegious*, which they impiously apply to the recep-

* Reply, p. 133.

† The same fraudulent suppression marks the Vicar’s quotation from the Council of Trent on this matter, Reply, p. 199. For at the same time that the Council teaches that Christ’s *body* exists in the Sacrament, under the appearance of *bread*, and his *blood* under the appearance of *wine*, in *virtue of the words of consecration* EX VI VERBORUM, it also teaches that in virtue of *concomitancy* or the natural union of the body with the blood, the *body* is also present under the appearance of *wine*, and the *blood* under that of *bread*. Sess. xiii. cap. 3.

‡ If I, being your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another’s feet. John xiv. 14.

tion of it in the Catholic Church. Those Oriental Churches, while they disputed with the Latin Church about the use of fermented or unfermented bread, never objected to her the practice of receiving under one kind, nor does the Latin Church object to them their two-fold communion;* it being mutually understood, that as Christ is *truly and really received* in the Sacrament, the *mode* of receiving him is a mere point of variable discipline. On the other hand the Act of 1st Edward VI., after enacting that "the B. Sacrament be hereafter *commonly* delivered and ministered under both kinds, *if necessity do not otherwise require, as in case of sudden sickness, &c.*," adds, "this practice should not be construed to the condemning of any other Church or Churches, in which the contrary is observed."† It has been shown in *The End of Controversy*, that both the Lutherans and Calvinists allowed of the single communion, in certain cases, no less than the Church of England, by the above-mentioned Act did. This being so : how intemperate, I say again, are the Bishop of Durham's anathemas in one of his charges, against the pretended *impiety and sacrilege* of the Catholic Church, on account of her discipline in this matter! and how absurd is the Vicar's reasoning in justification of them!

I cited in my former work, the conduct of our Divine Saviour, on the day of his resurrection, with respect to Cleophas and the other disciple, at Emaus, where: *He took bread and blessed and brake it, and gave it to them: and their eyes were opened and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight—and they went back to Jerusalem, and told the Apostles how THEY KNEW HIM IN THE BREAKING OF BREAD.*‡ This action of Christ I cited, after SS. Augustin and Chrysostom. &c. as an instance of his having himself dispensed the H. Communion under the form of *bread alone*. In the whole of these circumstances, however, the Vicar can discover nothing else, but that Christ gave a piece of common bread, without meaning any thing thereby, to the disciples whose guest he was!§ He quite forgets, however, to show how these disciples could *know Christ merely by giving them a piece of common bread!* In like manner, where the same Evangelist writes, that the three thousand converts of St. Peter, *were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles and in the communication of* THE BREAKING OF BREAD, *and in prayers.*|| He would have us believe that no-

* Even at Rome, the Pope's Colleges and Convents of Greeks are not only permitted, but also required to follow the discipline of their own country, as well in point of communion as of other points.

† See Heylin's Hist. Ref. p. 49.

‡ Luke xxiv. 30, 31, 35.

§ Reply, p. 206.

|| Acts, ii. 42.

thing more is meant, but that this numerous and fervent company persevered in believing what the Apostles told them, in *eating together* and in praying! In just the same manner the Vicar tries to turn the assembly of the Church of Troas, on *the first day of the week* (Sunday) *to break bread*, and to hear St. Paul preach,* into a mere convivial party, for corporal reflection! Having already treated at sufficient length the gross corruption of the English Testament, in substituting the conjunctive AND, for the disjunctive OR, 1 Cor. xi. 27, in order to destroy a pregnant proof of the sufficiency of communion under one kind, I shall say nothing more of the Vicar's last vain attempt to justify that corruption, except to remind you that his chief and best argument consists in again referring to the story of Dr. Kilbie.†

Previously to my further inquiry into the discipline of the Church in ancient times, respecting the manner of receiving the B. Eucharist, it is necessary that I should remind you, Dear Sir, and your fellow converts, that the question is not whether the Sacrament was or was not frequently, or even generally received, in both kinds? But whether it was so received as *necessary for the reception both of the body and the blood of Christ*, and therefore so received, at all times and under all circumstances? For if it should be proved that the Fathers and the Church, at any time, or in any case, approved of its being received under one kind alone, the Vicar's, and the Bishop of Durham's charge of impiety and sacrilege against the Church, falls to the ground, as far, at least, as concerns the Fathers and the ancient Church. The Vicar first quotes Cardinal Bona, to prove that "from the origin of the Church down to the twelfth age, the faithful, at all times, and in every place, communicated under the species of bread and wine."‡ But, to say nothing of the numerous exceptions from this rule, which the Cardinal subsequently makes or admits of, some of which will be mentioned below, the Vicar is guilty of an unpardonable infidelity in omitting the broad distinction which C. Bona makes, in the page from which he quotes, between *public communion* in the solemnity of the Mass, and *private communion*, out of the Church and the mysteries. "For it is certain," says he, "that the Clergy and Laity, men and women, received the sacred mysteries under both kinds, when they were present at the solemnization of them, and made their offering and partook of the oblation. But *out of the Sacrifice and the Church, always and every where the communion was*

* Acts, xx. 7.

† See above, Letter ix.

‡ Reply, p. 202.

in use under one kind."* A more dishonourable instance of garbling an authority quoted, than the one here pointed out, cannot perhaps be found: but you clearly see that it did not suit the Vicar to quote the passage fairly, for other reasons than the testimony which the ecclesiastical Antiquary bears to the ancient practice of communicating under a single species, in certain cases of constant recurrence.

The Vicar admits, that it appears from Tertullian, S. Cyprian, &c., that during the first Pagan persecutions the Christians were accustomed to take home with them the B. Sacrament, which they kept in their boxes, to communicate themselves; and he adds, that "those who partook of it in a secret manner, enjoyed a perfect communion of the body and blood of Christ."† But I should like to know what need there was, *in his system*, of the Christians carrying home the sacramental bread from their assemblies? and why any piece of bread from the pantry would not answer the desired purpose just as well? In fact, what is the Sacrament, shut up in a box, as he and B. Taylor have explained it above, but an *idolum*; a *nothing in the world*,‡ but a piece of bread! It seems, however, that this gentleman undertakes to prove from Tertullian himself, that those Christians who took home from the assemblies the element of bread, took the element of wine also. The passage of the Father here alluded to, is the following, and the object he had in view, when he wrote it, was to dissuade his wife, in case she survived him, from marrying with a Pagan. Supposing, however, this to have happened to her, and speaking of the Sacrament in the box, Tertullian asks her: "Will not your husband know what you privately taste, before all other food? And, if he knows it is bread, will he not suppose it to be what it is called? And, being ignorant of this, will he not, with sighs, remain in doubt whether it is bread or poison?"§

The whole question here confessedly is concerning the Sacrament in the form of bread; for if the form of wine were in the box, assuredly the Pagan husband would suspect the poison to be contained in that rather than in the other. "But," replies the Vicar, "this Father, speaking of the resurrection says: 'our flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ.'" Very well: and so may I say likewise.—Again: "In his address to his wife he urges her in two places to take the cup with earnestness of soul." No doubt he does so: but at the *hand of the deacon* in the Sacrifice of the Mass, when she assists at it, *not*

* Card. Bona, De Rebus Liturg. tom. iii. p. 700.

† Reply, p. 224.

‡ P. 144.

§ Ad. Uxor. L. ii.

from her own hand, when she communicates herself out of the private box, and such is the import of the passage referred to by the Vicar.* With respect to the story related by S. Cyprian, of an infant, who, after tasting wine, defiled with idolatry, could not swallow a drop of the consecrated species; the Father's words plainly imply that the liquid, and not the solid species, was administered to it, conformably with the discipline of that time, in regard to infants.† In vain would the Vicar persuade us that the youth, who was sent with the Eucharistic bread to the dying Serapon, as Eusebius relates the history,‡ and which he was directed to moisten, and so to pour it into the sick man's mouth, carried with him the liquid species also: there is not a word of the narration that intimates this, and every part of it signifies the contrary. When I referred to S. Basil's testimony, I did not allude to any thing that he elsewhere says, respecting the general practice of the Church in the solemn mysteries, but to his letter to Cæsaria, in which he speaks of the particular practice of the hermits, who preserved the sacred particles in their cells, for their private communion.§ Cardinal Bona, who brings many examples of the kind, mentions one monk in particular, Luke the Younger, who, having asked the Bishop of Corinth, how the solitaries were to receive the Sacrament without the ministry of a Priest, answered him that "they ought to preserve some of the sacred particles, and *instead of the sacred liquor*, to drink a cup of wine."||

I appeal to you, Dear Sir, and to every other reader of my *End of Controversy*, whether I ever pretended to bring "proof that there was only communion in one kind in the primitive Church," as the Vicar falsely charges me with doing.¶ No, Sir, I always knew and confessed that both species were generally ministered in the ancient Church: what I denied was, that this rule was *universal*, or that the observance of it, in any sort, regarded *the essence of the Sacrament*. To what purpose therefore does the Vicar cite S. Chrysostom, after S. Basil, to testify that "all are admitted alike to partake of the divine mysteries," and that "one body and one cup is offered to all." That the double communion was not an indispensable law in the judgment of the latter, is proved by what his fellow citizen and contemporary historian Sozomen relates of him. He tells us that a woman infected with the Macedonian heresy, having by way

* *De cuius manu desiderabit: de cuius poculo participabit?* Ad Uxor. The Father is here comparing the Christian Mysteries and their Ministers, with the impious rites and Ministers of the Pagan worship.

† Serm. de Laps.

‡ Euseb. B. vi. c. 44.

§ Tom. iii. Ed. Par. p. 279.

| Rev. Liturg. L. ii. p. 703.

¶ Reply, p. 228.

of satisfying her Catholic husband, presented herself in the Saint's Cathedral, to receive the Eucharist, contrived, by holding down her head, and with the help of her confederate maid, to exchange the sacred element for a piece of common bread, when she found the latter change in her mouth into a stone; which miracle Sozomen says, caused her to confess her crime to S. Chrysostom, and to return to the true faith.* Now, Sir, as it was impossible for this woman to have played her impious farce with the liquid species, it is plain that S. Chrysostom himself did, in some cases, allow of communion under one kind. A similar conclusion evidently follows, from the decree of Pope Leo, in the middle of the fifth century, and of Pope Gelasius at the end of it, together with proofs of the high authority which they exercised in the most important concerns of Religion at that early period, for, if the practice of receiving under both kinds had been universal, and was considered indispensably necessary, there could have been no occasion for those decrees to enforce it, in order to detect the Manichean heretics, who held the species of wine to be unlawful and impure. I mention the name of S. Jerom in order to notice the gross error which the Vicar ascribes to him, in making him say that "the body of Christ was carried in a basket, and the blood in a glass vessel, *for the relief of the poor.*"† So crude and profane an idea, I am persuaded, never entered the head of any other person besides the Vicar! No, Sir, S. Jerom, did not extol the holy Bishop Exuperius, for carrying about the B. Sacrament, as common food to relieve the poor, but for his extraordinary charity in having expended not only his own ample fortune, but also the plate of his Church, in supporting the indigent and redeeming the captives, taken by the Vandals, and thereby reducing himself to the necessity of using a wicker basket and a glass chalice in dispensing the sacred mysteries.‡ I observe that the Vicar passes over the two instances I brought, one of Satyrus, the brother of S. Ambrose, the other S. Birinus, the Apostle of the West Saxons, carrying the B. Sacrament, at sea in their neck-cloths (*Orarium*).§

In fact, it would puzzle his ingenuity to show how they could carry a liquid species in such a vehicle.

I shall close these proofs that the mode of communion in early times, namely, under one kind or under both, was considered *as a matter of changeable discipline* (the point which I originally maintained) with what is, in regard to the Vicar, a *domes-*

* Sozom. B. viii. c. 5.

† Reply, p. 226.

‡ Hieron. Ep. 4, 10, 11. Pref. in Lib. 1st. 2. Com. in Zach.

§ End of Controv., Let. xxxix. p. 66.

tic instance. The brightest light of Ireland in the sixth century, unquestionably was S. Columban, who, leaving his overstocked monastery of Benchor near Down, passed over to the Continent and founded flourishing convents in France and Italy, He was in correspondence with Popes, Bishops and Princes, but what most contributed to his renown, was the *rule* which still goes by his name, and which he imported into the monasteries of the Continent from his native country. In this, among other regulations, are the following regarding the reception of the Sacrament, namely, that the Monk, who, in receiving the Sacrament irreverently, "touched the sacred chalice with his teeth, should be punished with six strokes of the whip. But as to the novices and other unlearned persons, the rule says, that they shall not approach to the chalice at all."* Here we see a two-fold mode of communicating, established in the same convent, the Monks received under both kinds, the novices under one kind alone. I have adduced other instances of variation in this variable point of discipline, in the *End of Controversy*.

When a man's prejudices or passions determine him to adhere to a false doctrine or a wrong practice, there is no pretext too frivolous, nor any inconsistency too glaring for him to adopt in defending it. You have heard, Dear Sir, the Rev. Vicar deny to the Catholic Church, guided as she is, by *the spirit of truth, which teaches all truth*, and following as she does, the uninterrupted tradition of the Apostles, a right to determine what is, and what is not essential to the Sacraments; and you have heard him claim for his own Church, or rather for the civil power that founded it, within these three last centuries, a right to *use its own discretion* in these matters, without referring to any tradition at all. Accordingly he declares as follows: "With respect to the Eucharist, our Church retains *what is essential to that Sacrament*, while it has wisely omitted what would be useless, inconvenient, or impossible to be complied with. It performs the Sacramental action in the way commanded by Christ, when he said: DO THIS by blessing bread and eating it, and by blessing wine and drinking it, in remembrance of him. *In this consists the essence of the Sacrament of the Eucharist*; and to the punctual observance of it the Church of England is scrupulously attentive, while it omits circumstances of themselves indifferent."† Thus we distinctly see what constitutes the *essence* of the Sacrament, according to the definition of this theologian: it consists in "*blessing bread and eating it*, and

* "Qui percusserit dentibus calicem sex percussoribus, &c. Novi, qui indocti, et quicumque tales fuerint ad calicem non accedant." Reg. Colomb. Menard.

† Reply, p. 192.

in *blessing wine and drinking it, in remembrance of Christ.*" Hence of course, whenever all this is done, "the sacramental action is performed in the way commanded by Christ." Now, Dear Sir, I believe that all this has been regularly performed in your and most other pious Catholic families, at your ordinary meals; you *blessed the bread* on your table and you *eat it*; in like manner you *blessed the wine* on your table, and you *drank it*, and this *in remembrance of Christ*, conformably with the command of his Apostle: *Whether you eat or drink, or whatever else you do; do all to the glory of God.* 1 Cor. x. 31. *Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Coloss. iii. 17. You have therefore *performed the Sacramental action in the way commanded by Christ*, at every meal you have taken; *the other circumstances*, according to the Vicar's theology, being *of themselves indifferent*!! Nor is this the only absurdity and contradiction into which the Rev. Gentleman plunges, in following up his new system. For whereas, hitherto, in excluding the real essence of the Eucharist, which is the *real presence of Jesus Christ*, the Established Church has required the *real presence of the bread and wine*, at least as essential to the Sacrament (and indeed, we have, just now, heard the Vicar himself affirm, that *the essence of the Sacrament* consists in them); nevertheless, in his concluding note on this subject, he gives up these likewise, as things no way essential to it. His words are these: "Dr. M. says he has heard of British *made-wine* being used by Church-Ministers for real wine; and of the Missionaries to Otaheite using the *bread-fruit* for real bread." There is no doubt "but that such bread and wine should be substituted, in the absence of real bread and wine. Those aliments nourish and sustain the body, when the others cannot be procured; why therefore may they not be as efficaciously used, as those others, to convey the spiritual nourishment, which is imparted by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?"* Here we find the Vicar making light of the substances ordained by Christ, and extending the essential matter and benefit of the Eucharist to *any aliments which nourish and sustain the body*. To confine our view therefore to the Rev. Divine's own country: it is well known that in many mountainous and boggy districts of it, no other aliments are to be procured but potatoes to eat, and whiskey to drink, which also approach nearer to the nature of bread and wine, than do the fruits of the Indian trees, and the juices and sap of British bushes and shrubs. The consequence is, that according to the Vicar's system of theology, every cabin dinner over which the pious peasant says grace and makes the sign of

* P. 237.

the cross, in memory of Christ's sufferings, is that *very flesh and blood, which he gave for the life of the world*, John vi. 52, *the eating and drinking of which is, to the unworthy partaker of it, eating and drinking damnation to himself*. 1 Cor. xi. 29!!

I am, yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XIV.

Absolution.

DEAR SIR :—When I look back on the subjects I have been treating of, or forward to those which I am about to take in hand, I am lost in wonder at the confidence, with which the protesting sects and individuals respectively maintain that the words of Scripture are clearly in their favour, while experience proves that they agree together in nothing but in opposing the doctrine and authority of that unerring Church, which the Scripture so emphatically orders them to hear and obey. Thus, to cast a glance on the matter which I have been handling, the B. Sacrament, Luther being intent, as he acknowledges, on spiting the Pope,* denied Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass, but fiercely maintained it to be evident in Scripture that the bread and wine are *consubstantiated* with the flesh and blood of Christ; when presently he was corrected by his disciple Osiander, Cranmer's father-in-law, who denied this co-existence, and affirmed that nothing could be clearer in Scripture than the hypostatical or personal union of Christ with the bread; in consequence of which, it would be equally true to say: *Christ is bread, or bread is Christ*. Nay, said Carlostad, Luther's earliest disciple, it is unquestionable that when Christ said: *This is my Body*, he pointed to his body, and that he meant no more than his words express: *This body is my body*. To this Zuinglius answered, *A spirit appeared to me by night, whether black or white I forget*,† and suggested to me a more simple explanation of those words, namely, the words *This is my Body*, means, *This represents my Body*. Finally, Calvin interposed, and maintained the strict meaning of the words, but, at the same time, eluded that meaning, by saying Christ is

* Epist. ad Argentin.

† De Subsid. Euchar.

corporally present, but in a spiritual way ; he is really mandated, but by an act of the mind, not of the body. To this opinion, Cranmer, after his master, the Duke of Somerset, appears to have finally subscribed, some time about the year 1550. In the mean time the Catholics alone, while they are accused by all the contending sectaries of abandoning the literal and obvious sense of Scripture, are demonstratively the only Christians who adhere to it.

But to return to the subject announced above ; the Vicar makes an awkward excuse for not treating of it with the other points of the existing controversy in full detail, under pretence that he has discussed them in his *Answer to Ward*, which is, in a great measure, false, and which, upon the whole, is clearly seen to be an excuse for not meeting that opponent, whom he had boasted of defeating at every point.* After this, he tries to vindicate the late B. Porteus's forced construction of Christ's commission to the Apostles, when, *breathing upon them, he said : Receive the Holy Ghost : whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven to them ; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained :* John, xx. 22. These important words, which the Catholic Church understands in their plain natural meaning, signify, according to the late Bishop and the present Vicar, "The power of discerning by the spirit, and of declaring who were penitent and pardoned, and who were not, and of inflicting miraculous punishments on wicked persons, which is binding their sins, and of removing such punishments, which is loosing their sins."† Do pray, My Dear Sir, read over again the text of St. John, together with these Reverend Divines' exposition of it, and then say whether, in your opinion, Luther's burlesque translation of the first words of Genesis‡ was ever more applicable to a scriptural exposition than it is to theirs. Nor is their exposition of the Catholic doctrine of absolution, when they compare it with their own, one whit more faithful. In fact, they represent it to be a claim on our part to a discretionary power of pardoning or refusing to pardon persons, without distinction, whether right or wrong.§ You know, Dear Sir, whether such doctrine as this was inculcated to you, when you became a Catholic : or rather, you know that the very reverse of it was impressed on your mind ; namely, that no confession, nor any absolution whatever could avail you, without *sincere sorrow, a firm purpose of amendment, and of making*

* Pref. Rem. p. xliv. p. xlv.

† Porteus' Confutation of the Errors, &c. pp. 44, 45. Grier's Reply, p. 246.

‡ "In the beginning the cuckoo eat up the sparrow and its feathers."

§ Confut. 44. Reply, p. 56.

reparation for the injuries you might have been guilty of against others, to the uttermost of your power; and the Vicar knows this also, as it stands so conspicuous in the decrees of our Council which he refers to,* and in all our catechetical instructions, if he would but speak the truth. But the most flagrant infidelity of all others on the part of the Vicar, in this matter, because it is accompanied with most ostentation and insult, consists in his shameful misrepresentation of my appeal to the testimony of the famous Chillingworth, in opposition to B. Porteus. Having then quoted, at full length, in *The End of Controversy*, the clear and nervous text of S. John, xx. 22, 23: *Whose sins you shall forgive, &c.*, as likewise the Bishop's absurd construction of it; namely, that they do not imply real power of *forgiving sins*, but only "a power of *declaring who are truly penitent and pardoned*, and of *inflicting miraculous punishments*, and of *preaching the word of God*."† I opposed to this construction, Chillingworth's emphatical language, in which, after mentioning Christ's "breathing on his Apostles, and thereby conveying and insinuating the Holy Ghost into their hearts, he renewed (says Chillingworth) or rather confirmed and sealed unto them that glorious commission, whereby he delegated unto them an authority of binding and loosing sins upon earth, with a promise that the proceedings in the court of heaven should be directed and regulated by those on earth."‡ I then cited the author's exhortation to his flock, in his following page, in consequence of the above doctrine: "Therefore, I beseech you—that you will not suffer that commission, which Christ has given to his Ministers, to be a vain form of words:—Have recourse to your spiritual Physician—as to one that hath authority delegated to him from God himself, to absolve and acquit you of your sins."§ The whole of this acute author's reasoning on the subject is too long and verbose for insertion here: but it will appear to any one, who will take the trouble to consult his book, that there is not a word in it, either on his own part, or A. B. Usher's, whom he cites, which does not confirm the point for which I quoted him, namely, that in his opinion, and in that of his Church, at the time when he wrote, Christ had given to the latter a *real power*, no less efficient in heaven than on earth, of *absolving and acquitting sinners of their sins*, and not the bare illusory power of *declaring who are penitent, &c.* True it is that Chillingworth says, in a paragraph preceding the quoted one, in the words of A. B. Usher (after saying much in com-

* Conc. Trid. Sess. xiv. c. 4, p. 120, &c.

† Letter xli.

‡ Sermon vii. Relig. of Protest. p. 408.

§ Ibid, p. 409.

mendation of the Confession of Sins), "The thing which we reject is that new pick-lock of Sacramental Confession, obtruded on men's consciences, as a matter *necessary to salvation* by the Conventicle of Trent."* But, how does the latter passage contradict the former? And why should I not quote Chillingworth, where he maintains the *efficacy of absolution*, because he elsewhere denies the necessity of *Sacramental confession*? There is not a word omitted in my quotations, that weakens or qualifies, in the smallest degree, my assertions on the subject, or that adds the least strength to his: nor is there the shadow of any fraud whatsoever on my part, though the Vicar affects to triumph over me through several of his pages: just as if he had convicted me of one. No, Sir, the fraud is on his side, and a shameful fraud it is; where he publishes the following deliberate falsehood, for the purpose of mis-stating the fundamental ground of the controversy between us; "Dr. M. makes him (Chillingworth) argue for the necessity of Sacramental confession."† Nor is there less, but rather more multiplied fraud, where he pretends to show that "there are no discordant opinions on the subject, but *the most perfect harmony* between the two divines," Chillingworth and Porteus.‡

The Vicar disclaims all concern with "Luther's ribaldrous trash,"§ as he calls it, (who, by the by, was a much greater Divine than either of the two whom he has just been praising); but, in thus abusing the chief Apostle of Protestantism, he equally abuses the next to him in authority, Melancthon, and the Confession of Ausburg, which is acknowledged to be the prototype of the English Articles,|| and of course Cranmer and Ridley the immediate authors of those Articles and the whole Liturgy, under the orders of the Duke of Somerset. I did not indeed, in my above-mentioned work, "attempt to prove that the Church of England, in Edward the Sixth's reign, held that a particular absolution was *necessary* in confession," as the Rev. Vicar falsely asserts;¶ yet I proved, from the *Liturgy* itself, from the *Acts of the conference at Hampton Court*, from the established *form of ordaining Priests*, and from other arguments, that the Church of England, then at least, considered her *absolution* as a *real acquittance from sin*, and not an empty *declaration that the sinner is penitent and pardoned*, according to the

* Serm. vii. Relig. of Protest. p. 408.

† Reply, p. 251.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid, p. 245.

|| "It is generally believed that Cranmer and Ridley were chiefly concerned in framing the forty-two Articles, upon which our thirty-nine are founded. They followed principally the Ausbourg Confession, which was drawn up by Melancthon." *Elem. of Theol. by Dr. Tomline*, vol. ii. p. 35.

¶ P. 251.

Bishop and the Vicar's explanation of it. I likewise proved that *auricular* and secret confession to the Priest* was strongly recommended by that Church, as indeed it is still to *dying persons*,† the whole of which doctrine and ordinances put together I confess I am unable to *reconcile with itself*, at the same time that it evidently overturns Dr. Porteus' and the Vicar's system. I cannot quit this point without expressing my wish to know what idea the Vicar affixed to the form by which he was ordained being the same with that which completes the character of the Catholic Priesthood: "*receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, &c*?"‡ Did he fancy that he then barely received a commission to *declare* that certain sinners are penitent and pardoned? But this the town-cryer, without any ordination at all, can declare full as well as he can!

It is evident how much the Vicar is annoyed with the exposure of the doctrines and forms of his own Church, in this matter, by the flimsy and imaginary pretexts and distinctions he resorts to for evading their consequences. The first of these is, that Cranmer's Liturgy contains the following ordinance, respecting absolution, which he says "Dr. M. prudently withheld: unless *restitution be made* to your neighbour, neyther the absolution of the Priest can any thing avail:"§ just as if Catholics held that absolution is available without making satisfaction to the injured neighbour! You know the contrary, Dear Sir, and so does the Vicar: but he was pressed for a pretext! His second distinction is, that the practice of confessing sins is *obligatory* in the Catholic, but *discretionary* in the Established Church.|| Be it so: but this does not prove that the latter did not formerly, nor indeed that she does not still, believe in the efficacy of sacerdotal absolution. In the mean time, I would ask any serious Christian this question: In case Jesus Christ has left in the Church a *power of remitting sin*, to the truly penitent (and the same is to be said with respect to the ordinance of the Eucharist) which Church acts the part of a true mother towards her children, the ancient Church, which *obliges them to avail themselves*, at stated times, of the spiritual benefit, or the new one, which does not *require this* of them at any time? His next argument I shall barely state, without attempting to answer it. He alleges that though the Minister of his Church "is directed in the Rubric *to move* the sick man to make a special confession of his sins, yet in the Rubric immediately preceding, he is *earnestly* (in Italics) *moved*, to be liberal to the poor!"¶ The Vicar's last argument against the Priest's possessing a judiciary

* See King Edward's order of Communion. B. Sparrow's Col. p. 20.

† See Rubric in Visit. of Sick. Com. Prayer.

‡ Reply, p. 158.

§ P. 255.

|| P. 256.

¶ P. 258.

power in the forgiveness of sins, is expressed in these terms : "As if the Almighty's will were to depend on the decision of a fallible creature, and his justice to be dispensed at the discretion of man ! It is certain that after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, a power of this kind was vested in the Apostles, &c."* But, is not this sarcasm as strictly applicable to the sacrament of Baptism as to that of penance ? And did the Almighty's will, even after the day of Pentecost, depend on the decision of the Apostles ?

The Vicar has excused me from the task of stating in greater detail the doctrine of the Ancient Fathers on the subjects of confession and absolution, because, notwithstanding his threat of "depriving Dr. M. of their adventitious aid,"† he has not ventured to grapple with any one of those whom I have already brought against him ; nor has he even attempted to answer that short and convincing argument, which I brought, to show that the obligation of confession in particular, could not have been palmed or forced upon Christians at any time whatsoever ;‡ he himself assigns the cause, though in offensive terms, where he calls it, "a Religious slavery"§ on the part of the people, and "a Spiritual dominion"|| on the part of the Clergy ; for neither would Christians, in general, have submitted to the former at any period whatsoever, if they had not believed, from their infancy, that this practice is of Divine institution and necessary ; nor would the Clergy have imposed this yoke upon *their own necks*, which we see them universally bear, from the lowest clerk up to the sovereign Pontiff himself. And it is to be observed that, when I speak of *Christians* in general, I speak of all the inhabitants, during most of the ages since that of the Apostles, of Italy, France, Spain, the British Islands, Scandinavia, Germany, Greece, with all the great Patriarchates of Asia and Africa, who have been divided from the Latin Church, some of them since the fifth, others since the twelfth century, all of whom have ever acknowledged, and still acknowledge the necessity and efficacy of the Sacrament of penance, consisting of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, joined with the Priest's absolution. The Vicar may sneer at my argument, from his inability to answer it : but I repeat, with respect to the practice of confession in particular, what I said concerning the Catholic Religion in general ; there is no way of accounting for its commencement at any time since that of Christ, but by supposing that all the above mentioned hundreds of millions of rational beings went to bed Protestants, and awoke the next morning Papists !

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* P. 261.

† P. xliii.

‡ End of Controv. Let. xli. 90.

§ P. 256.

|| P. 260.

LETTER XV.

On Indulgences.

DEAR SIR:—The present subject being complex of itself, and that which most of all others is misrepresented by Dr. Porteus and other Protestant polemics, the writer took special pains in his work to show, first, what an indulgence upon Catholic principles is *not*, secondly *what it is*; and on this, as well as on other points of Catholic doctrine, he claims to be believed, in preference to Dr. Porteus, and the Rev. Mr. Grier, as he publishes his exposition, with his name affixed to it, in the hearing of the other Pastors of his Church, and of its head Pastor in particular, with a consciousness of being liable to be called to an account, if he misrepresents the tenets of his Church.—He has denied then, in opposition to the impious calumnies of Bishop Fowler,* the Rev. Mr. Benson,† Mr. C. De Coetlogen,‡ &c. that an indulgence, upon Catholic principles, consists in *a license to commit sin*; and, in opposition to Mrs. Hannah More, that it consists in *the pardon of future sins*,§ and in opposition to almost all Protestants, that it consists in *the pardon of any sins at all*, or in *a transfer of the overplus of the goodness of the saints joined with the goodness of Christ*, as the late Bishop of London and the Vicar of Templebodane have injuriously published.|| In the last place, the writer has proved that the indulgences of the Catholic Church being, as she terms them, *heavenly treasures*,¶ it would be, at all times, a heinous and sacrilegious crime for any person whomsoever to pretend to sell or buy them. Hence, as the writer shows, the Catholic Church in all her general councils, for a great many ages past, has exerted her utmost power to prevent such detestable simony, in all its shapes;** while the Vicar, though he specially treats of the subject, is unable to show any means that have been taken to put a stop to those advertisements, which, as the writer observed,†† continually appear in our newspapers, for the sale and purchase of ecclesiastical benefices, *with the care of souls*.

Having dissipated the above-mentioned false notions and descriptions of a Catholic Indulgence, the writer goes on to show what it really is: namely, *a total or partial remission of the temporary punishment, which, in the general economy of*

* See his Treatise in B. Watson's Collect., vol. vi. p. 382.

† Ibid. vol. v. p. 273.

‡ Seasonable Caut.

§ Strict. on Fem. Educ. vol. ii.

|| Brief Confut. p. 53. Reply, p. 267.

¶ Trid. Sess. xxi. de Indulg. ** Letter xliii. p. 98. †† Reply, p. 275.

God's justice, remains due to sin, after the essential guilt of it, and the eternal punishment due to it, have been remitted through the merits of Jesus Christ. That such temporary punishment is frequently reserved for the sinner, after his guilt has been forgiven, the writer proved from Scripture,* Tradition,† and our own bitter experience.‡ Instead, however, of replying to these weighty reasons, or going into the substance of the cause, the Vicar amuses himself with arguing that it is the right method to treat of Purgatory *before* Indulgences, because the unprincipled Jewell§ says: "Take away Purgatory and what need is there of indulgences?" Just as if the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland, after taking away Purgatory, had not still, the former its *White Sheet*, and the latter its *Stool of Repentance*, together with the claim of granting an *Indulgence*, from the disgrace of these, in consideration of another more beneficial penalty! That the established Church claims and exercises this power of *Indulgence*, by what is called a *Commutation of Penance*, I proved by several of her Canons.|| I likewise brought proof that the money which was raised, by the commutations in question, was frequently diverted to other improper purposes:¶ but I was not so unjust, as, on that account, to charge the Church of England with selling licenses to defame our neighbours, to get drunk, to swear profanely, to commit fornication, &c. for specific sums of money, in the manner that he charges the Catholic Church with the blasphemies and absurdities of Friar Tetzels, in the sixteenth century (in case he was really guilty of uttering them.) The Vicar bears testimony to the piety and benefit of Indulgences, as they existed in the primitive Church; and then falsely accused the Popes with having perverted them, in the eleventh century, namely, by that discipline which saved Christianity from being over-run and trodden to the dust in Europe by the ferocious and impious Mahometans, as it had been in Asia and Africa. Descending to the time of Luther, the Vicar makes amends to this his spiritual father, for all the abuse he had heaped upon him in his fore-

* Exod. xxxii. 34. 2 Kings, alias Sam. xii. 14, 2. Cor. ii. 10.

† Tertul. ad Martyr. S. Cypr. De Laps. "Inspi David, cui jam dictum fuerat, per prophetam: *Dimissum est Peccatum*: evenerunt quædam quæ minatus est Deus propter ipsum peccatum."—S. Aug. in Ps. 50.

‡ Viz. The temporal death, sickness, &c. to which we are still subject.

§ See his character above, in the Postscript to Letter v.

|| End of Controv. p. 101, p. 102.

¶ Since *The End of Controversy* appeared, the learned and conciliatory Rector of Southreps, the Rev. G. Glover, A. M., in his *Remarks on Bishop Marsh's Comparative View*, produced proofs of money being received in the Diocese of Chester, as a *commutation of penance*, otherwise for a *Protestant Indulgence*, so late as the year 1735. Remarks, p. 73.

going pages, by the commendations he bestows upon his opposition to Indulgences. It is proper, however, he should know that the German monk, at first, only condemned the abuse of them; and, that, on becoming incensed against the Pope, when he fell foul of Indulgences themselves, by a natural course of reasoning, he denied the utility of good works in general, together with free will, attributing the whole of man's justification to the *imputation*, or lending of Christ's merits to him.* The Vicar now proceeds to excuse the solemn Indulgence granted by Luther, Melancthon, our Divinity-Professor of Cambridge, Bucer, and five other Protestant Pastors, to Philip Landgrave of Hesse, to have two wives at the same time, on account of "the peculiar circumstances in which he (Luther) was placed—being surrounded (he says) by malignant enemies, while he was fearful of risking the loss of a powerful friend, who would probably have increased their strength in the event of a refusal!"† He then calls this celebrated Indulgence, granted by Luther and his seven leading Apostles to the Prince of Hesse, "an *isolated instance* and a *single exception* to the manner in which the Reformers proceeded;" after which he talks of "numberless Indulgences granted by the Bishops of Rome," &c.—How much the Vicar imposes upon his readers, in this account of the Reformer's *manner of proceeding in this business*, I need no other testimony than that of his own Venerable Cranmer, who, in a letter to his brother-in-law, Osiander, reproaches these German Divines not only with "permitting the younger sons of noblemen to entertain strumpets, in order to prevent the parcelling out of their estates,"—but also with "allowing a man a plurality of wives, without the ceremony of a divorce:"—adding, "that this is matter of fact you acquainted me in some of your letters; as also, that Melancthon himself was present at one of these weddings."‡ With respect to "the Indulgences of the Bishops of Rome," the whole that the Vicar ventures to say of them, respecting the point in question, is to ask: "Will Dr. M. believe that P. Clement VII. made the offer of an Indulgence to Henry VIII., through Casalis, his ambassador, that he might have two wives?"§—I distinctly answer him, that I will not be-

* See Luther, *Le Servo Arbitrio*, &c.

† Reply, p. 275.—The Vicar suppresses the chief motive for Luther's granting this Indulgence. This is expressed by the Prince, his patron, in his instructions to Bucer, who was his envoy to Luther for procuring the Indulgence. His words are these: "I am sensible that with the wife I have, I neither can nor will mend my life, whereof I take God to witness: so that I find no means of amendment but by the remedies God afforded the people of old, that is to say, polygamy." The authentic documents of this whole transaction were published from his records by Charles Count Palatine, and are abridged by Bossuet. *Variat. B. vi.*

‡ Collier's *Ecc. Hist.* P. ii. p. 56.

§ Reply, p. 274.

lieve it: 1st, because the letter which he refers to in L. Herbert's History (which is also contained in Burnet's Collection) implies no such offer; secondly, because if the Pope had made such an offer, it cannot be supposed that he would have excommunicated the King for actually marrying a second wife, the former being living, as he actually did: thirdly, because it is still less to be supposed that Henry, Cranmer, and the rest of the courtiers would have refrained from publishing this offer, in defence of the second marriage, when it did take place; and again afterwards by way of reproach to Clement, for issuing his Bull of excommunication. But, though the Pope did not consent to the polygamy in question, the above-named heads of Protestantism in Germany *did consent to it, and even advise it*; for, in those very instructions which the Landgrave gave to his envoy Bucer, for obtaining their permission for a second marriage, he distinctly states that "To his knowledge, Luther and Melancthon advised the King of England not to break off his marriage with the Queen, his wife, but besides her to marry another also."* The Vicar finishes his defence of Luther with the following words: "As to what Dr. M. says about Luther's *preaching up adultery*, it is to be utterly disregarded; for, often as the imputation has been repeated, it never yet came forward substantiated by an iota of evidence."† The words in Italics are cited from the *End of Controversy*, Letter xlii. p. 103, where also I quoted a passage from Luther's Sermon on Matrimony, which immoveably supports my assertion. In the *Letters to a Prebendary*, I gave this Libertine Reformer's expressions on the subject at greater length, which I will again repeat in the original Latin.‡ This being done, I should wish much to ask Mr. Grier to his face, before respectable persons, the following question: *When you affirm, Sir, that the charge against Luther of preaching up adultery has never been substantiated by an iota of evidence*, do you mean to deny that the extract from his sermon quoted in the notes, is an *exhortation to adultery*?—Or do you deny that the extract quoted from Luther's works is *genuine*?—In the former case I will leave to you the opinion of your friends and patrons, as well as of the learned world in general. In the latter case I pledge myself to send the volume of Luther's works, containing the passage, to the Swan Inn, in Birmingham, for you or your friends' inspection, on any day you may appoint. My edition of Luther

* Instruct. N. 6.

† Reply, p. 275.

‡ "Tertia ratio divortii est ubi alter alteri subduxerit, ut debitam benevolentiam persolvere nolit, aut habitare cum renuerit. Hic opportunum est ut maritus dicat: *Si tu nolueris, altera volet: si domina nolet veniat ancilla.*" Serm. de. Matrim. Opera Luth. tom. v. fol. 123.

is in eight folio volumes, published at Wirtemberg, by Melancthon.

The Vicar expresses himself in his present chapter very indignant at my disbelief of a certain fabricated and absurd paper of Indulgences, which Dr. Porteus certified to be in his possession, having been bought at Rome, he says, for a small sum, by a friend of his.* I never questioned his Lordship's veracity in this matter, or doubted of his possessing the paper in question : all that I answered was, that he might buy forged notes and counterfeit coin for still less money than was paid for that paper. He is likewise much displeased with the indulgence published by the late B. Moylan, for the consecration of his North Chapel at Cork, and not a little jealous of the solemnity attending that ceremony (which probably he witnessed as well as myself,) and of the vast crowd of people who assisted at it, compared with those who went to the adjoining Cathedral Church.† To this I answer, that he cannot deny that the conditions annexed to that Indulgence, by way of satisfaction, consisting of prayers, assisting at instructions, &c. are good ones: for the other parts of Penance, Contrition, Confession and Restitution, where it was requisite, had gone before. With respect to the opinion and devotion of the people, it is plain that these cannot be commanded or controlled. They *love the beauty of God's House*, Ps. xxv. 8, though the Vicar condemns it, as "superfluous ornaments;" and they are delighted to see a number of their Bishops assembled at such a ceremony, as they used to meet together on the same occasion, in the reign of Constantine. Their love for the coadjutor Prelate, Dr. J. Macarty, who preached the Consecration Sermon, as I witnessed on a memorable occasion, was enthusiastic. In fact, the whole of his life, every day, from morning to night, was taken up in doing the work of an Apostle, till he happily closed it by dying the death of a Martyr.‡ Finally, their veneration and devotion towards their great and good Bishop, Dr. Moylan, were as boundless as his merits were. Loyal to his Sovereign, he preserved peace in the South of Ireland, when Hoche's fleet, with *Emancipation* inscribed upon its flags, was on that coast; for which eminent service he received the thanks of Government, and the freedom of Cork and Drogheda. Jealous of the purity of Ireland's faith and morals, he repaired the injuries done to it by other less worthy pastors, and for the same purpose instituted

* Reply, p. 269.

† P. 271, 273.

‡ He died of an infectious fever, caught from a dying officer, who insisted on being attended by him, being perfectly sensible of the danger, and resigned to the fate.

the order of the Visitation. Zealous for the cultivation and social benefits of its Catholic progeny, he founded and dispersed throughout it his charitable daughters of the Presentation.

His saltem accumulem donis.—VIRE.

J. M., D.D.

POSTSCRIPT.

The Rev. Vicar having referred to his *Answer to Ward's Errata*, for a fuller refutation of several points of the Catholic doctrine than is contained in his present REPLY, I have consulted that work for what he says on the subject of Indulgences. This is of great length, but consists chiefly of extracts from a work, which, he says, "should never be overlooked when any question occurs, in which Popery is concerned. Its title, which is descriptive of its contents, runs thus: *The Book of Rates used in the Sin Custom House of the Court and Church of Rome*, by *Anthony Egan, B.D., formerly Confessor-General of Ireland*." This work, according to the Vicar, was republished in 1809, by Baron Maseres, and an abridgement of it by Dr. Hales: the former of whom observes, that "it can never be unseasonable to expose a Religion, so destructive to the peace of society, so derogatory to the glory of God, so contrary to the purpose of Christianity, &c."* To be brief, the substance of this book is the same that has been published by other Protestant writers, under the name of *Taxa Cancellariæ Romanæ*, being the pretended prices, required by the See of Rome, for permission to commit a great variety of the most abominable sins, and to violate all kinds of oaths and vows; but as it differs in some remarkable particulars from the other works of the same nature, methinks an account of them will be interesting to you, Dear Sir, and your Catholic friends. The first particular that strikes me in Friar Egan's and Vicar Grier's Table of Licences and Dispensations, compared with those of other dealers in the same articles, is the great advance in their prices. For example, according to the Rev. C. De Coetlogon, you are charged no more than five sixpences for the crime of incest with a mother, six sixpences for that of debauching a virgin, the same for perjury, and only one crown with five groats for the murder of a father, mother, wife, &c.† Neither the Rev.

* Answer to Ward's Errata by the Rev. R. Grier, pp. 153, 154.

† Seasonable Caution against the Abominations of the Church of Rome, p. 13.

Mr. Benson, in his *Man of Sin*,* nor De Banck,† according to my reckoning of French money, greatly exceeds this moderate charge, while Egan and Grier, dealing in nothing below pounds sterling and British shillings, charge £6. 2s. "for the breach of an oath, which cannot be observed without incurring everlasting damnation" (if any one can understand this); £15. 4s. "for commutation for murder;" £36. 9s. "for permission to keep a woman," "the same for a crusader, who neither kills nor wounds any one," and £60. 15s. 3d. "for licences for indulgences for Colleges;" which article is as unintelligible as the former. Far more interesting and important is the following intelligence which the Vicar publishes on the authority of Egan: "That the Book of Rates is studiously withheld from ordinary Priests, and that being classed amongst the *Arcana Imperii* of the Papal Court, is made known only to certain Penitentiaries, to whom the absolution of particular and heinous sins is committed, and that, of such persons, there is one or two in every diocese in Ireland. Before these are vested with power, he says, they must take an oath of Secrecy not to reveal the mysteries of their church either to clergy or laity, or those suspected to be of so acute parts, or of so much learning and honesty as might make them scruple their authority. With respect to those sins, called reserved cases, if a man acknowledge himself guilty of any such to an ordinary confessor, he can only tell him where the Pope's banker resides, who will absolve him, so he brings with him the price of his sin."‡

Instead of arguing with the Vicar on the contents of this most extraordinary publication, which I have here abridged, I call upon him, as a gentleman and a clergyman, to answer me, whether having reconsidered them he still believes in them? If he answer affirmatively: then I charge him as a loyal subject and a good citizen, to use the means he has in his hands, or can easily procure through the Bishop of Meath, the Rev. Mr. Nolan, and others in their predicament, to find out, at least, who those detestable bankers are, that traffic in the vilest anti-christian and anti-social crimes which can be imagined, and to make them refund the wages of their iniquity. If he answer negatively: then I charge him to make that *restitution*, the making of which, after the commission of an injury, he has described to be characteristic of his church.§ Yes, he must do justice to the characters not only of that Catholic gentry, whose kindness he

* B. Watson's Theol. Tr. Vol. v. p. 274.

† Answer to ward, p. 153.

§ Reply, p. 254.

† Bayle's Dict.

courts,* but of the millions of his Catholic countrymen and fellow Christians, which he has outraged to the last degree: he must do it, I say, either spontaneously now, or by constraint at the great day of universal retribution. In the mean time, I will furnish the Vicar and his two above-mentioned supporters, with a short account of Friar Egan, from the pen of a Protestant of equal learning and integrity, I mean the historian of the University of Oxford; which will, probably, cause them to rank him in future with the Bowers, the Foudrineres, and the Dorans, of later times. Wood writes thus: "In the month of June, this year, 1673, came to the University of Oxford from London, an Irishman, called Anthony Egan, a Franciscan Friar, and, in the beginning of July following, he was entered a student in the public library. This person had lately left the Roman Catholic religion, wherein he had been educated and professed, and under pretence of suffering for what he had done, came to the University, more for the sake of relief than study. And after he had continued there about four months, in which time he obtained the charity of sixty pounds or more, he went to Cambridge, thinking to obtain there the like sum; and, when that was done to return, as was generally reported, to his former Religion. Among other things that he published are these: '*The Franciscan Convert*;' in the title-page of this he writes himself *Confessor General of the kingdom of Ireland and Chaplain to many persons of quality there: 'The Book of Rates in the Sin Custom-House,' &c.*"†

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XVI.

Purgatory.

DEAR SIR:—You will not fail to observe that the whole which I write to you on particular subjects of controversy, is, as logicians term it, *Ex Abundanti*, being no way necessary to ascertain the truth of revelation on these several subjects, but merely added for your further information and satisfaction concerning them, and to show that we can meet Protestants on the ground they claim of Scripture, Reason, and the Fathers. Yes, Sir, all my present labour is superabundant, because in proving

* Pref. Rem. p. xiv.

† Athen. Oxoniens.

that Christ has left a *living speaking authority in his Holy Church*, to expound to us his two-fold rule of Scripture and Tradition, as I have proved in the first part of the work, which the Vicar nibbles at without being able to injure it, I demonstrated at once THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, and rendered all discussion of the different branches of it unnecessary.—Again it is proper to observe that this Holy Church, in declaring her doctrine, does not profess to argue upon it, in a controversial way, either from Scripture or Tradition; much less does she pretend to make new articles of faith, or to expound the original articles in a different sense from that in which she has always held them, though, it is true, she sometimes adopts new terms, such as CONSUBSTANTIAL and TRANSUBSTANTIATION, as more energetical and expressive of her belief, in opposition to the rising heresies of the times. In short, her constant language is, NIL INNOVETUR; NIL NISI QUOD TRADITUM EST.* *Such and such is the sense of Scripture: such and such is the doctrine of our Predecessors, the Pastors of the Church, since the time of the Apostles: Though we or an Angel from heaven preach to you another gospel—let him be Anathema.* Gal. i., 8. This observation deserves the notice of the Rev. Vicar in particular, who at every turn exclaims: *the Council of Trent or such other Council asserts this and that doctrine, but does not prove it from Scripture, &c.*

The Vicar enters upon the subject of purgatory with complaining of the “*inveteracy*” of the Catholic Church, by which I understand her *constancy* in maintaining it: and thus much I grant to the Reverend Gentleman, that she never changed her doctrine or her practice in this point, as Cranmer and his followers altered theirs. He then accuses Bellarmine and Bossuet with *arrogance* and *self-sufficiency*, in supporting the same doctrine. All this, however, is barely an introduction to the Vicar’s abuse of the present writer, for having dared to detect the sophistry and false statements of Dr. Porteus.† This Prelate asserts that Catholics have “no Scripture proof of the existence of purgatory;” and that “if there be such a place, Christ and his Apostles would not have concealed it from us.”‡ The inconclusiveness of this argument, considered in itself, I showed in the first place by the following parity: “the Scripture nowhere commands us to keep the *first day* of the week holy: we always read of sanctifying the Sabbath or *Saturday*, but never read of *Sunday*, as a day of obligation: though if there be such

* Pope Stephen, 1. Ep. 74.

† Reply, p. 277. End of Controv., Let. xliii. p. 107, &c.

‡ Confut. p. 48.

an obligation, Christ and his Apostles would not have concealed it from us." In the next place I proved the absolute falsehood of the argument, by showing that the existence of purgatory, and the advantage of praying for the souls detained in it, are proved from Scripture. On the former point, the Vicar argues at great length, to show that there was sufficient reason for the Apostles transferring the obligation of the last day of the week to the first day of it (in doing which he contradicts his former doctrine);* but the present question is not about the motives there were for the Apostles making the change, but for the lawfulness of our laying aside an obligation imposed upon mankind at the creation, and confirmed when the law was given, and our taking up with a different obligation, without any *positive injunction of Holy Scripture*.

In proof, however, that the Scriptures do sanction the belief of a middle state of souls suffering for a time on account of their sins, which is the definition of purgatory, I argued in the first place from the fact of the Religious Priest and Captain, Judas Maccabeus, having sent ten thousand drachmas to the Temple of Jerusalem, in order that Sacrifices might be offered up for the souls of some of his soldiers, who had fallen in battle; because, as the texts add, *it is a holy and a salutary thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins*, 2 Mac. xii. 46. At the same time I proved that the Book of Maccabees, here cited, is an integral part of Scripture, and that if it were not so, it would prove the faith of God's people in this article, under the ancient covenant. The Vicar next tries to make his readers believe, that the Sacrifices which Judas offered for the dead, were intended for the safety of the living, notwithstanding the sacred penman's express declaration that *it is salutary to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins*. But, continues the Vicar, these soldiers "died in mortal sin;"† hence he concludes that prayers and sacrifices could not avail them. I answer, that the pious Priest, Maccabeus, was a better judge in this matter than the Vicar of Templebodane, and that it is plain from the text that the Pagan donaries taken by the Jewish soldiers at Jamnia, were taken as *spoil*, not as subjects of *idolatry*. To my proofs from Luke xii. 59, and Luke xvi. 22, as likewise from 1 Peter iii. 19, though supported by S. Augustin, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Origen, S.

* Reply, p. 278. In proof that the obligation of the last day of the week was transferred by the Apostles to the first day of it, he alleges their practice of "meeting and breaking bread" on this day: now in a former page, p. 206, he maintains that the *breaking of bread*, mentioned in the Acts, means nothing more than eating an ordinary meal.

† Reply, p. 282.

Jerom, to whom I might add S. Athanasius, S. Cyril, and a host of other Fathers, the Vicar makes no other answer than by calling them "trite, foolish, and unscriptural;" saying that he "will not trespass on the reader's patience, or follow Dr. M. in his stupid track."* The two other texts I quoted from the New Testament, namely, 1 Cor. iii. 13, &c., and Mat. xii. 32, though equally applied, as I stated, to the dogma of purgatory, by Origen, S. Ambrose, S. Jerom, S. Augustin, S. Gregory, &c., the Vicar *disposes of*, according to his usual phrase, by opposing to them the opinion of Secker, Wake, and some other nameless commentators! Methinks the above-cited words of S. Peter, at least, declaring that *Christ being put to death, preached to the spirits that were in prison*, agreeably with the article of the Creed: *He descended into Hell*, and which have embarrassed the most eminent Protestant Divines, deserved a more respectful treatment at the Vicar's hands, than to be passed over as *foolish* and *stupid*. A. B. Wake, whom he often cites, says that "the spirit of Christ, after his death, together with the soul of the penitent thief, was carried by the Angels into Paradise, where the souls of the righteous rest till the day of the resurrection."† And B. Tomlin admits "that the Hell into which Christ descended means, the place appropriated for the reception of departed souls in the intermediate time between death and the general resurrection."‡ Both these Divines, together with Pearson, Burnet, and numerous others, admit of an intermediate or third place for departed spirits, distinct from Heaven and Hell: now this place is what Catholics call *purgatory*: for as to the nature of it, and whether there are external torments in it, whatever reason there is for believing this to be the case, the Church has defined nothing, and accordingly she entered into a concordat with the Greeks at the Council of Florence, though they denied such exterior torments, on their barely acknowledging that *there is a purgatory, and that souls therein detained, are helped by the prayers of the faithful here on earth*. But instead of agreeing with the eminent Prelates of his own Church, the Vicar subscribes to the impieties of Calvin, concerning the death of Christ and his descent into Hell, agreeing with him that this is "true, holy, and comfortable doctrine." Instead, however, of qualifying it, or arguing against it on the present occasion, I shall satisfy myself with quoting it below, as it stands in his *Institutions*.§

* P. 283.

† Principles of Christ. Relig., Sect. 11.

‡ Expos. of the Thirty-nine Articles, Part iii. Art. 3.

§ "Nihil actum erat, si corporea tantum morte defunctus fuisset Christus: sed operæ simul pretium erat ut divinæ ultionis severitatem sentiret, quo et

I pass over the Vicar's inconclusive reasoning on the present subject, grounded as it is on two notoriously false suppositions, namely, that *all sins are equal*, and that there is no mercy in *commuting a heavy punishment for a light one*.* He finishes his unsuccessful attempt at reasoning with the following absurd *petitio principii*: "So truly nonsensical is the idea respecting purgatory, that it must long since have been abandoned, did not interested motives stand in the way."† Now this is so far from being true, that the contrary is directly the case. I will show it, with respect to our own country. When the Lord Protector, Seymour, with the help of Cranmer and Ridley, first exchanged the Catholic for the Protestant Religion, they found nothing *nonsensical* in the idea of a middle state of souls, or in prayers for the souls detained in it. Accordingly they left the Catholic prayers of this nature to remain in the new Protestant Liturgy; and Archbishop Cranmer, who was now the Protestant Pope of England, by his own choice sung a solemn Mass of *requiem* for the soul of the deceased French King, June 19, 1547, at which B. Ridley preached, and eight other Prelates assisted.‡ But the Protector Seymour having contrived to advance himself to the rank of a Duke, under pretext that it was the intention of the deceased King Henry to promote him,§ and no other resource for raising money to support this dignity, but the endowments of the Colleges, Hospitals, and Chanteries, or foundations for mortuary Masses, &c., of which latter there were no less than 2374 in different parts of England, he procured an Act of Parliament for the seizure of these, nominally for the King's service, but really for his own and his fellow Counsellors' emolument.|| It was then that Somerset House was raised in all its ancient magnificence, and that the family of Seymour, which before was scantily provided for, rose to princely opulence. In like manner, it was then that Cranmer and Ridley, who before, by word and practice, had promoted prayers for the souls in purgatory, discovered that "these are a fond thing, vainly invented, &c." which position they inserted in the Articles of the

iræ ipsius intercederet, et satisfaceret justo judicio. Unde etiam eum oportuit cum inferorum copiis, æternæque mortis horrore, consertis manibus, luctari. Correctionem pacis nostræ illi impositam fuisse ex Propheta nuper retulimus, fuisse propter scelera nostra a Patre percussam, attritum propter nostras infirmitates. Quibus significat in locum sceleratorum, sponsorum, vadem, adeoque instar rei submissum.—Ergo si ad inferos descendisse dicitur, nil mirum est, quom eam mortem pertulerit quæ sceleratis ab irato deo infligitur.—Dios in anima cruciatus damnati ac perditii homines sustulit." Instit. Calvini. L. 11. c. 16. s. 10.

* P. 283.

† Ibid.

‡ Heylin's Hist. of Ref. p. 40.

§ Ibid, p. 32, p. 33.

|| Ibid, p. 58.

English Church,* altering the Common Prayer conformably with it, all which was confirmed by Parliament in 1552. Thus the suppression of the doctrine of purgatory and prayers for the dead, and not the invention and continuance of it, sprung from wicked avarice.

The Vicar's respect for the authority of the ancient Fathers, is just as flexible as was the Religion of Cranmer. He set out with "a determination to deprive Dr. M. of their adventitious aid,"† and thus far has kept up some sort of pretence of being supported by their authority; but, on the present subject, his confidence quite fails him. He now is reduced to confess that "though the authority of the Fathers is *respectable*, it is *not decisive*, and that it is with this feeling he contends about its possession with Dr. M."‡ In short, he admits that "Origen, Cyprian, and Tertullian speak of Purgatory;"§ but he adds, that "he first conceived there were no pains at all after this life but those of purgatory:" just as if this opinion, admitting it to be rightly stated, weakened the Father's testimony for Purgatory."|| "The second," he says, "applied this doctrine to the penance inflicted on the lapsed in the persecutions." Just as if this, I again say, diminished the authority of the quotation!¶ He adds, "the third applied it (the doctrine of Purgatory) to Christ's millenary kingdom;" which is false and would signify nothing if it were true.** But why, in case the Vicar meant to treat a question of literature *honorably*, and a question of Religion *conscientiously*, why has he not taken notice of those clear and forcible passages I quoted from S. Augustin and S. John Chrysostom, and referred to in S. Ambrose and other Fathers?†† The answer is obvious.

It is not to be wondered at that our Vicar should be found unable to cope with so many Catholic Fathers, when it appears that

* Article xxiii. in the Forty-two Articles and xxii. in the Thirty-nine Articles.

† Pref. Rem. p. xliii.

‡ P. 286.

§ P. 287.

|| See Origen, Hom. 14, Levit., and Hom. 16, Jerem.

¶ See the strong passage I quoted from S. Cyp. Let. xliii. p. 108.

** Tertullian says nothing about the Millennium, in the passage I quoted from him, nor in other passages of the same import.

†† S. Aug. Serm. 172. Enchirid. cap. 109, cap. 110. Confess. L. ix, c. 13. S. Chrys. c. 1. Philip Hom. 3, where the Father expressly says, that *prayers for the dead in the tremendous mysteries were ordained above by the Apostles*. See S. Cyril's Abstract of the Ancient Greek Mass. Letter xi. See the account of the funeral of the Emperor Constantine, by Eusebius, where he describes the surrounding people shedding tears, and *offering up prayers for his soul*. Life of Const., l. vi. c. 71. See also S. Ambrose's Sermon on the death of the Emperor Theodosius, where he says: "I loved him, and therefore will follow him to the land of the living: nor will I quit him until my tears and supplications shall have obtained that he be admitted to the holy mountain of the Lord."

he cannot even manage the eminent Protestant Doctors, whom I quoted, as siding with the Catholics, some of them for the existence of a place of temporary punishment after death, that is to say *Purgatory*, others for the practice of praying for the dead. On this head the Vicar says: "of eight Divines of the Church of England, whom he (Dr. M.) expressly mentions as believing that the dead ought to be prayed for, I can only speak decidedly of one, A. B. Usher?" And how does he prove his point, with respect to Usher? He says, 1st, that the latter, in his account of St. Patrick's book *Detribus Habitaculis*, observes that there is no mention of any other place after death, but heaven and hell." To this I answer, that not only S. Patrick,* but likewise Usher himself, included in the word *Hell*, not only the place of torment for the reprobate, but also the *Limbus Inferi*, in which the Patriarchs dwelt of old, and the imperfect just are detained at present, the same into which Christ descended.† The Vicar says, 2dly, that the Archbishop, in admitting that the Irish Church in the fifth century, like the rest of the church, was accustomed to pray for the dead, alleges that: "In those elder days it was an usual thing to make prayers and oblations for the rest of those souls which were not doubted to be in glory."‡ Let S. Augustin explain this whole matter. He says: "When we offer the sacrifice of the Altar, or give alms for the faithful departed, they are acts of thanksgiving for those who are perfectly good; they are propitiations for those who are not very bad; and, though they are of no benefit to the very bad, they are matter of consolation to the living."§ He says, 3dly, that Usher quotes S. Jerom to prove that, "When we shall come before the judgment seat of Christ, neither Job nor Daniel can entreat for us;" and that, "in hell no prayer can be heard." But how does this prove that a Job or a Daniel cannot help, by their prayers, a soul *before* it is presented to be judged, and in the intermediate state of purgatory! That S. Jerom believed in purgatory, and the benefit of prayers for the dead, is abundantly testified in various parts of his works.|| Thus we find the Vicar, with all his boasting of

* In S. Patrick's Second Council, cap. 12, published by Spelman, is found a decree forbidding that the holy Liturgy should be performed for certain scandalous sinners after their death, in the same manner as S. Cyprian had done with respect to those who appointed clergymen for their executors.

† Among the other warm controversies that were carried on between A. B. Laud and A. B. Usher, through their respective Chaplains, Dr. Peter Heylin, and Dr. Richard Parr, one was concerning Christ's Descent into Hell. In managing this, the last-mentioned quotes his patron Usher, as referring, in his defence to the Ancient Fathers, respecting Abraham's bosom—the paradise of the good thief—the outskirts, that is, the Limbo of Hell. See Appendix to the Life of Usher, by Dr. Parr, p. 26.

‡ Reply, p. 289.

§ Enchirid. c. 110.

|| Comment. in Prov. c. ii. In Isaiam. Ps. 13. Advers. Jovin. &c.

support from the Fathers, giving up three of them by name, on the subject in debate, and letting judgment go by default, as the lawyers term it, with respect to the rest of them. In fact, he has not the shadow of a claim to support from any one of them; and of the eight eminent Prelates of his own Church, who have been named in the controversy, he only attempts to claim one, by doing which, he betrays his cause instead of serving it. With respect to the distinguished Protestant writers of our own time, he attempts to vindicate the Bishop of Exeter alone from what he calls "an imputation of rank Popery;"* but which, in fact, was a sentiment that did honour to his Lordship's learning, as a theologian, according to what has just been proved, and to his heart as a man. The fact is, as I stated, that this Prelate, in a sermon on the death of our late lamented Princess Charlotte, *prayed for her soul*. This fact the Vicar denies, and says he has authority to deny it. Perhaps he may have authority: but thus far we have nothing but his bare word for it. In the mean time it is certain, that if I have been misled on this score, so has the nation at large, through all the usual vehicles of intelligence, and other the most respectable publications.†

You will recollect, Dear Sir, that in concluding my letter on Purgatory, and prayers for the dead, I spoke of the great consolation, which Catholics derive from the practice of the latter, especially at the funerals of those who are near or dear to them, observing that death itself cannot break that happy *communion of Saints*, which exists among the members of their Church; insomuch that they can often render greater service to their friends after their death, in praying and giving alms for them, than they can in any other way during their life-time: while the funerals of our mistaken Protestant brethren, I said, "are cold, disconsolate ceremonies, in which the survivors cannot otherwise show their regard for their departed friends than by costly pomp and feathered pageantry."‡ These reflections have roused the feelings of the Vicar, and provoked him to challenge a comparison between the burial-service of the Church, which he belongs to, and that of any other Church, whether Latin or Greek. But after all, Dear Sir, you cannot help observing how the Vicar's affected indignation is nothing else but a polemical artifice, to misrepresent my reflections. In fact, I did not re-

* Reply, p. 290.

† See *Remarks on the Bishop of Peterborough's Comparative View*, by the Rev. G. Glover, A. M., who says, "We had even very lately a Sermon preached and published on the death of the Princess Charlotte, by a venerable Bishop, now upon the bench, concluding with a prayer that God would receive her soul." P. 85.

‡ End of Controv. Letter xliii. p. 114.

represent the passages from Job, the Psalms, and the New Testament, of which the Established Service chiefly consists as *cold and disconsolate* in themselves: I could not signify this, without blaspheming the word of God, and disgracing my own Breviary and Missal, out of which almost all the Funeral Service of the Church of England is taken; I barely spoke of the latter as it regards the benefit of the departed souls, and of consequence the feelings of the living friends, to neither of which it professes to afford aid or consolation, while the whole intent and object of the Catholic funeral liturgy is to administer these to them both.

J. M., D.D.

POSTSCRIPT.

Extreme Unction.

The Vicar writes so little, and that so little to the purpose, on this subject, that I do not find it necessary to write you a separate letter upon it. The laboured attempt of B. Porteus to distort the clear text of St. James, is so unnatural, that the Vicar himself seems to leave it to the exposure and refutation it meets with in *The End of Controversy*. What the Apostle says is this: *Is any man sick among you, let him bring in the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* James, v. 14, 15. The following is the gloss of B. Porteus, on this ordinance of the Apostle: He says that the anointing of the sick by old men or elders, was the appointed method in primitive times of miraculously curing them; whence it follows, as I observed, that no Christian died in primitive times, except where old men and oil could not be procured. He adds that "*the forgiveness of the sick man's sins, which St. James speaks of, means the cure of his corporal diseases.*"* The Vicar says little in support of the Bishop; what he chiefly aims at is to elude the strong proofs I brought that this Apostolical ordinance is a *Sacrament of the Church*, instituted first and principally for the relief of the soul, and secondly for the relief of the body, if it be for the glory of God and the real good of the patient, and that the ministers of it are not *old men*, or read of any de-

* Confutation, chap. ix. p. 58.

scription but as they are here termed, *the Priests of the Church*, We are agreed as to what constitutes a Sacrament; our definition of one and that in the Church catechism, not being materially different from each other. In short, it is agreed upon that there is an *exterior rite* prescribed by the Apostle, namely, the anointing the sick person with oil; on the other hand, there is undeniably a *spiritual grace*, namely, *the saving of him by the prayer of faith*, together with *the forgiveness of his sins*, which latter clause the Vicar chooses to suppress, in quoting the words of St. James. In excuse for this omission, or rather in opposition to the Apostle, he says afterwards, that "the forgiveness of sins can be as well had by the absolution of the Priest."* But this, as I have intimated, is denying the Apostle's declaration; and, secondly, it is unsaying all that the Vicar himself has been saying in his ninth chapter about *Absolution from Sin*. I wonder that, in his distress, he did not avail himself of the authority of his incomparable Selden, who says "that the unction here prescribed *for the sick was intended for the dead*,"† or rather that of Patriarch Luther, who calls this Epistle of St. James, "*a dry chaffy Epistle*, unworthy of an Apostle."‡ In speaking of the three things necessary to constitute a Sacrament, the present writer said, respecting the ordinance in question: "Here we see all that is requisite, according to the English Protestant Catechism, to constitute a Sacrament: for there is an *outward visible sign*, namely, the anointing with oil; there is an *inward spiritual grace*, namely, the saving of the sick and the forgiveness of his sins; lastly, there is *the ordination of Christ*, as the means by which the same is received, unless the Bishop (Porteus) chooses to allege, that the Holy Apostle fabricated a Sacrament, or means of grace, without any authority from his heavenly Master."§ These latter words, which so clearly imply that not even an Apostle could institute a Sacrament, it pleases the Vicar to transform into the Very opposite meaning, by making me signify, that "as St. James was ordained to the Apostolic office, he consequently had the power to institute a Sacrament."¶

You have seen, dear Sir, in the above-cited letter in *The End of Controversy*, the Sacrament of Extreme Unction proved, not only from the Epistle of St. James, but also from the express testimony of Origen, S. Chrysostom and Pope Innocent I.,

* Reply, p. 195.

† Selden de Syned. L. 2.

‡ De Captiv. Babyl. Edit. Jen. The motive of Luther's contempt of this Canonical Epistle, is because it denies the sufficiency of faith alone, and insists on the necessity of good works.

§ End of Controv. Letter xlv. p. 116.

¶ Reply, p. 296.

all of whom quote that Epistle as the Scriptural authority for it. You have also seen references to the testimonies of Cyril of Alexandria, S. Gregory the Great, and the venerable Bede, to the utter discomfiture of Dr. Porteus, who denies its being "mentioned for the first six hundred years of the Church."* And yet the Vicar, pledged as he stands to "deprive me of the adventitious aid of the Fathers," says not a word to all this! I likewise referred to all and every one of the numerous Christian Churches, in Europe, Asia and Africa, that had been separated, some for five, others for ten centuries from the Catholic Church, before the existence of Protestantism, all of which acknowledge Extreme Unction to be a Sacrament, all of which are in the habit of administering it to the sick, no less than the Catholic Church. It was certainly incumbent on the Vicar to account for this universal fascination of the Christian world: there is no other way of doing this but the supposition which I suggested before, and with which he is so much offended, namely, that on some night or day they forgot all that they had previously believed, and were bewitched into a new Religion.

LETTER XVII.

The Invocation of Saints.

DEAR SIR;—In reading this and the following letter, it will be proper you should refresh your memory with another perusal of the 33d and 34th Letters in *The End of Controversy*, as also with the Rev. Vicar's 13th chapter, which he publishes as a *Reply* to them. It is plain that he is weary of his task, as he becomes still more negligent and confused as he advances. He passes by unnoticed the strongest Scriptural evidence, the most positive testimonies of the Fathers, and the most indisputable axioms of natural reason, to mispend his time and ink on a few points of no essential consequence to the main questions at issue. His principal arguments are drawn from the two extravagant and time-serving Books of Homilies,† the former compos-

* Confut. c. ix. p. 61.

† The following extracts may serve as samples of their moderation and truth: "Laity and Clergie, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendome (a horrible and dreadful thing to think) have been, all at once, drowned in abominable Idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man,

ed by Cranmer, the latter, as is generally supposed, by Jewel, whose respective characters you have seen above. These books never had any authority, even among Protestants, being like an upper garment, or great-coat, says Dr. Fuller,* which men put on or throw off at their pleasure.

The first question at issue between the Rev. Vicar and myself, is the following one: Is he warranted in pronouncing, as he does, in the title-page of his 13th Chapter, that "*The invocation of Saints is Blasphemous and Idolatrous?*"—In refutation of this heinous charge against Catholics, as made by other writers and preachers before him, I proved, in my above-mentioned work, by express quotations from the General Council of Trent, from the large Catechism of that Council, and from the elementary Catechism for the instruction of Catholic children, that it is "an article of Catholic Faith, that, as the Saints have no virtue, merit, or excellence, but what has been gratuitously bestowed upon them by God, for the sake of his Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ, so they can procure no benefit for us, but by means of their prayers to *The giver of all good gifts*, through their and our common Saviour, Christ."† In short, I proved, that Catholics invoke the intercession and prayers of the Saints in heaven, in no other way than they invoke the intercession of their fellow Christians here upon earth. If the former is blasphemous and idolatrous, the latter is blasphemous and idolatrous also. If the latter is innocent and pious, the former is innocent and pious also. In further proof of this being the unfeigned belief of Catholics on the subject in question, I cited an Anathema from one of our most popular works of controversy, in repeating which, I averred, that every Catholic in the Kingdom will at all times readily join me. This says: "Cursed is he who believes the Saints to be his Redeemers, who prays to them as such, or who gives to them the honour that belongs to God."‡ By way of showing from Scripture that God permits and encourages us to invoke the prayers of his chosen

and that by the space of 800 years and more." *Perils of Idol.* P. iii. p. 58. —Speaking of the crying injustice, cruelty, and sacrileges of the tyrant Henry VIII., in seizing and turning to his own profit all the Abbeyes and Convents in the Kingdom, to the number of above a thousand, and leaving their unoffending inhabitants to starve, the unprincipled Cranmer, in his *Homily on Good Works*, P. iii. p. 38, ascribes all this to *an inspiration of God*, and compares the unfeeling and sensual monster, who, as Sir Walter Raleigh says, "never spared man in his wrath nor woman in his lust," with the holy Kings of Israel, Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias.

* Church Hist.

† End of Controv., Letter xxxiii. p. 17.

‡ Papist Misrepresented and Represented by The Rev. I. Gother, abridged by Bishop Challoner.

servants, in addition to our own prayers, I cited Jacob's entreating and obtaining the blessing of the Angel with whom he mystically strove,* his calling upon his own Angel to bless Joseph's two sons,† and God's command to Job's unfaithful friends, to engage that holy Patriarch *to pray* for them, the Almighty declaring: *His face I will accept, that your folly be not imputed to you.*‡

Such, but in greater detail, were the arguments with which I repelled the less injurious charges of Dr. Porteus, against the Catholic doctrine and practice of praying to the Saints; which, in case they are conclusive, the Vicar's weightier charges of *Blasphemy* and *Idolatry* against it must be foul and irreligious calumnies: on the other hand, if they are not conclusive, it was evidently his business to prove this, by showing that I had not given a true exposition of the Catholic doctrine, or that this doctrine, even thus explained, is still blasphemous and idolatrous. Instead, however, of attempting any thing of this nature, he flies off, at the beginning of his chapter, to a point of quite a secondary nature, and which no way affects the one that he professes, in the title of his chapter to prove. In fact, Sir, if the Council of Trent, instead of leaving the faithful, as I showed to be the case, to their own devotion in this matter, had commanded them, under pain of Anathema, to pray to the Saints every day of their lives, this would not help him forward in his undertaking of demonstrating that the practice itself is *Blasphemous* and *Idolatrous*. In the mean time, the Council speaks for itself, where, instead of declaring that it is *necessary to invoke the prayers of the Saints*, it confines itself to saying that it is *good and profitable so to do*.—But let us hear the Vicar out on this his favourite topic. His words are these: "Invocation is said to be more than simply *good and profitable*; it is profitable, according to Dr. M.'s gloss, to have recourse to their prayers, help, and assistance, and it is further profitable to obtain favours from God, through his Son Jesus Christ; that is, the Invocation of Saints is profitable to bring about man's salvation! Now if this be not making it an article of faith, and a positive law of the Church, I cannot see what an Article of Faith means."§ In reading over a second time attentively this chaos of words, the only sense I can extract from them is this: that *Dr. M. having asserted that the Invocation of Saints is profitable to bring about man's salvation, he thereby makes it an article of Faith* (which is downright nonsense), and likewise that *it is a positive law of the Church*, which is clearly false. Thus, for example, I say that,

* Gen. xxxii. 36.

† Job, xlii. 8.

‡ Ibid. xlvii. 16.

§ Reply, p. 309.

subscribing money to Middlesex Hospital is profitable to salvation, but in saying this I do not create an *article of faith*, nor do I lay down a *positive law of the Church*! The Vicar proceeds in his vain attempt to throw a mist round the transparent Decree of the Council, and of the enlarged *Catechism for Pastors*: their language is clear: his is unintelligible. Speaking next of the English Catechism, which he calls "milder than the Pope's Catechism," he says: "It is not from the public formularies of the Church of Rome that we can derive the justest notions of its doctrines, but from its daily practice and its general observances."* What the Vicar means is, that to learn the doctrine of the Catholic Church, her collects in the Missal and other prayers are to be consulted, in preference to her Creeds, to the definitions of her Councils, and to her Catechisms and books of Instruction. This is contrary to common sense and practice, as in our general language, and even in our prayers, we often make use of expressions that require explanation to make them true and accurate, whereas, in formal expositions of our belief, we declare it in the clearest terms we can find. To illustrate this, I showed that Protestants, no less than Catholics, are obliged to have recourse to an explanation of the petition in the Lord's Prayer, *Lead us not into temptation*; and to another of the articles in the Apostles Creed, *He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father*.

To say a few words now of the Collects in the Roman Missal, which the Vicar so foully garbles and misrepresents: it is a downright falsehood that these "rest the hope of our salvation on the merits and intercession of the Saints, rather than on the merits and mediation of Christ;"† for there is not one of these Collects, which is addressed to any Angel or Saint, or that asks of God for any benefit or favour, for the sake of the prayers and good works of any Angel or Saint, except "*through his Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with the Father, in the Unity of the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end.*" This the Vicar knows full well to be true, as well with respect to the Collects for the festivals of St. Patrick and St. Thomas, which he singles out, as of the other Saints.‡ The Vicar pro-

* P. 302.

† Ibid.

‡ The following are the Collects in the Roman Missal, on the festivals of the two Saints in question. "Grant, Omnipotent God, that the venerable solemnity of the blessed Patrick, thy Confessor and Bishop, may increase to us devotion and safety, *through our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee, world without end.*"—"O God, for whose Church the glorious Pontiff, Thomas, fell by the swords of the impious, grant, we beseech thee, that all who implore his assistance, may obtain the salutary effect of their petition, *through our Lord Jesus Christ,*" &c.

ceeds in his own style of illogical argumentation : " Would a Saint be addressed in prayer, if he were thought unable to give that assistance for which he was asked ?—We fairly answer *No*.—Now I answer *yes*.—Very likely he might, in case the petitioner thought that the Saint could *obtain it* for him by his prayers to God." He goes on : " Our Homilies therefore say that it is in *this faith*, in which the *blasphemy* of such *Invocation* consists."* I answer, that whatever falsehood or impiety is contained in the Homilies, their authors, Cranmer and Jewel, had too much sense to say that *blasphemy consists in any faith or belief* whatsoever. It is really irksome to be obliged to argue with such a disputant. But, the Vicar has one more argument, and this is his capital argument for proving that Catholics, in general, and myself by name, are guilty of Idolatry. It stands thus : " If, as the above-mentioned Homily says, *Invocation* be a thing *proper to God*, it must be absolute Idolatry, however explained or recommended by the Trent-Canons, to give to the Creature that honour which is only due to the Creator, &c."†—I must again vindicate the Homilies from the nonsense which the Vicar ascribes to them : *Invocation* is not a thing *proper to God* ; it *rather belongs to man* : and when it is employed by man, it does not constitute Idolatry, unless it be addressed to some created being, to *bestow as from himself* those benefits which God alone can bestow. *Invocation* addressed to an angel or a man, is no Idolatry, when the object of it is barely to beg of him to pray to God for us. The Vicar is a grammarian, if he be not a logician nor a divine, and therefore he ought to know that to *invoke*, signifies nothing more than to *call upon*, and by no means implies that the person invoked is possessed of the attributes of God, or even that he is possessed of any independent power whatsoever.

Having vindicated certain parts of the Church of England homilies from the Vicar's mistaken defence of them, I have now to render the same service to some of her canons and injunctions, which he has equally misapprehended. This defence is unavoidably connected with the defence of myself from a gross charge which he has brought against me. The case is this : The good old Bishop of Durham experiencing the same distress that the Vicar feels to make out his charge of blasphemy against the Catholics, on account of their begging their deceased friends to render them, in heaven, the service they were accustomed to perform on earth, that of praying for them, bethought himself of the following new medium or argument for this purpose. He says : " It is blasphemy to ascribe to Angels and Saints, by

* Reply, p. 303.

† P. 304.

praying to them, the divine attribute of *universal presence*.”*
 The inconclusiveness of this argument I showed in the following short address to him: “You, my Lord, believe, conformably with the laws of the State,† and the injunctions of your own Church,‡ in the existence of sorceries, enchantment, and witchcraft, invented by the devil to procure his counsel or help, wheresoever the conjuror or witch may happen to be: do you therefore ascribe the divine attribute of universal presence to the devil? You must assent to this, or else you must withdraw your charge of blasphemy against the Catholics, by reason of their invoking the prayers of the Saints wheresoever they themselves are upon earth.”§ The parity is exact, and the conclusion inevitable: but the Vicar, from a confusion of ideas, mistaking the *belief* of sorcery for the *approval* of it, exclaims as follows: “How Dr. M. could find nerve to bring forward those documents (articles and injunctions of 1559, &c.,) in proof that our church believes in the efficacy of sorceries and the like, is more than I am able to account for”|| The truth, Sir, is, that however I am convinced of this Church having been led astray by the politics of Edward and Elizabeth, I have not nerve enough to deny that she believes in the sorcery of the witch of Endor, and the other sorceries mentioned both in the Old and the New Testament, or to assert that without believing in their existence she has contributed to the framing and execution of so many injunctions and penal laws against them, as she has done to a very unwise and unjustifiable extent.¶

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* Charge, 1810, p. 12.

† 5. Eliz. cap. 1. 1 Jac. c. 12. Blackstone says, “though the penalty of death against witchcraft is abolished, it is deservedly punished with imprisonment and the pillory.” B. iv. c. 4.

‡ Injunct. A. D. 1559. B. Sparrow’s Collect. p. 89. Art. Ibid. p. 180.

§ End of Controv. Letter xxxiii. p. 20.

|| Reply, p. 307.

¶ It is presumed that few persons will acquit of a very large share in this charge, “the learned, venerated, and authorised organ of the English Church,” as the Bishop of St. David’s, in his *Grand Schism*, p. 10, calls B. Jewel. This Prelate, in a sermon before Q. Elizabeth, thus addressed her: “It may please your Grace to understand that witches and sorcerers have wonderfully increased. These eyes have seen most evidently marks of their wickedness. Your Grace’s subjects pine away even unto death; their colour fadeth; their flesh rotteth; their speech be removed, and their senses bereft. Wherefore your poor subjects petition that the laws touching such malefactors, may be put in due execution, for their horrible doings.” In the ensuing Parliament an Act passed making witchcraft felony, and great numbers suffered death upon it in this and the following reign. In the year 1612 as many as nineteen persons were arraigned upon it, in the single county of Lancaster, of whom ten were condemned to death.

LETTER XIX.

Religious Memorials.

DEAR SIR :—The Vicar finds fault with the title of the present letter : I adopt it because it applies to all the subjects I have here to treat of, pious pictures, statues, crucifixes, emblems and relics ; and because it expresses the object and nature of the respect that we Catholics pay to them. We venerate them, in as much as they represent or bring to our remembrance the holy persons or things they relate to, not for any excellence they have of themselves. In short, we do not make and retain these objects, according to the calumny of our opponents, *for the purpose of venerating them*, as the heathens did their idols, but we venerate them *because they are memorials of the persons and things they relate to*. This you will bear in mind, as likewise the necessity to which the Vicar and his fellow polemics are reduced of finding pretences for their unhappy departure, and continued separation from the True Church ; none of which is so plausible and popular as that of Pagan idolatry, with which they charge her. Hence the vociferous declamation of preachers against *wooden gods*, and the inexhaustible sophistry of controversialists about the *worship of images*.

In refutation of the above-mentioned calumnious and impious charge, I produced, as I likewise did in my last letter, the high and definitive authority of our general Council of Trent, which declares that, “ though the images of Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and the other Saints are to be kept and retained, particularly in Churches, and due honour and veneration paid to them, yet that we are not to believe there is any divinity or power in them, for which we respect them, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in them, as the heathens of old trusted in their idols.”* To the same intent I produced our first or elementary catechism, which treats this subject as follows : “ *Question*. Does this commandment forbid the making of images ? *Answer*. It forbids the making them, so as to adore or serve them : that is, it forbids making them our Gods. *Question*. May we pray to relics or images ? *Answer*. No, by no means ; for they have no life nor sense to hear or help us.” Lastly, I quoted the emphatical anathemas of our above-mentioned celebrated work, *The Papist Misrepresented*, &c., in pronouncing which, I pledged myself that every Catholic will join : “ cursed is he that commits idolatry, that prays to

* Sess. 25.

images or relicks, or worships them for God." And, whereas B. Porteus had denied that the Scriptures allow any exterior respect whatever to be paid to such memorials, I referred to the veneration paid by God's faithful servants, and under his sanction to the Ark of the Covenant, namely, a chest of settim wood, containing two pots of Manna and the tables of the law, and being surmounted with the carved figures of two Cherubims. Before this memorial the faithful Joshua and the Elders of Israel prostrated themselves in prayer to God on their defeat at Ai;* for looking profanely into this, the Bethamites were severely chastised by God.† and for his fidelity in guarding this Obededom was richly rewarded by him.‡ Surely these instances which I referred to, are sufficient, without mentioning others, to show that the Scriptures do allow and sanction an exterior respect to Religious Memorials. With respect to Relicks in particular, I mentioned the revival of the dead body, related in the fourth Book of Kings,§ by its touching the remains of the prophet Elisha, and the miracles wrought by means of handkerchiefs and aprons which St. Paul had sanctified.|| All these Scriptural proofs I fortified abundantly from the writings and the practice of the Holy Fathers and primitive Christians.

It might be expected from my Rev. Opponent, that, having undertaken to give A REPLY to *The End of Controversy*, he would have questioned the fidelity of that exculpatory evidence, which I drew from the Decree of our General Council and the other documents, and from the testimony of the Fathers, but especially from the Holy Scriptures; or, at least, that he would have attempted to explain it away: but no, he takes no notice whatever of all this, just as if it were nothing at all to the purpose; but whereas I incidentally mentioned in a note that Queen Elizabeth persisted, during many years, in retaining "a Crucifix on the Altar of her Chapel, till some of her Puritan Courtiers engaged Patch, the fool, to break it; no wiser man, says Dr. Heylin, daring to undertake such a service;"¶ the Vicar flies off from his proper task to take up this matter, where he reproaches the Queen for not having carried on the business of the Reformation as far as he wished it to have been carried. In fact he bewails "The influence of Popish prejudices on her mind, and that she had not proceeded on those pure principles of Christianity, by which the conduct of the pious and enlightened Edward had been regulated;"*** namely, *the boy Edward*, whose

* Jos. vii. 6.

† 1 Kings, alias Sam. vi. 19.

‡ 2 Kings, vi. 12.

§ 4 Kings, xiii. 20.

|| Acts, xix. 12.

¶ Letter xxxiv. p. 25.

** Reply, p. 308. Having mentioned, in my *Inquiry into Vulgar Opinions concerning Ireland*, that I had seen fragments of the true Cross of Christ,

scholastic exercises consisted in translating into French corrupted passages of the Bible concerning Images and Idolatry; to amuse his infant mind, while his insatiable uncle Somerset swept away all the ornaments and utensils of Religion, under pretext that they were devoted to Pagan Idolatry!

But, says the Vicar, "our Church is not silent about the consequences of permitting Images to remain in places of worship. The Homily, we quoted, says that Idolatry cannot possibly be separated from Images any long time, but that, as an inseparable accident, or as the shadow followeth the body, when the sun shineth, so idolatry followeth the public having of images in temples."* And yet the Vicar himself had told us in the preceding page, that "as far as Protestants are concerned they (the images) may remain in harmless repose in their niches:"† and not to mention that not only in the Lutheran Churches abroad, but also in our Cathedral and other Churches at home, images of all sorts; Angels, Saints, animals, and even Pagan Deities, are to be seen in great numbers, without imputation or danger of Idolatry. But to speak more directly to the present point; of what weight, I require to know, are these printed harangues of Cranmer and Jewel, to prove that I adore stocks and stones, instead of the living God, when my faith and my conscience prove to me the contrary?

In arguing with B. Porteus, who had brought a very insufficient argument to convict Catholics of Idolatry, I stated that Protestants of the Establishment are accustomed to kneel to the Sacrament, to worship the name of JESUS, to bow to the empty Throne, and to kiss the material part, that is the paper and leather, of the Holy Scriptures;‡ this I stated by way of illustration, not by way of reproach, since Catholics are in the habit of doing the very same things: when lo! the Vicar falls foul of me, for having, as he alleges, "furnished grounds for the outcry of the Dissenters, on the score of Idolatry against the Established Church."§ The remainder of the Vicar's chapter relates to the manner of dividing the commandments. He pre-

the Vicar impiously calls it "the accursed Instrument of our Saviour's sufferings," and in opposition to the express testimony of S. Cyril, S. Paulinus, S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, and several other Fathers, on the bare credit of his, the Vicar's word, denies that the Cross was discovered by the Empress Helen. On this occasion he compliments his countrymen and the present writer with the following flowers of speech: "The poor credulous Irish, who have ever been the dupes of juggling impostors, will swallow all his lying wonders as undoubted facts; reported as they are by the accredited agent of their Hierarchy, a Vicar Apostolic, a Bishop of Castabala *Ipsæ!*" Answer to *Ward's Errata* by the Rev. Richard Grier, A. M. Master of Middleton School, p. 64.

* Reply, p. 309.

† P. 308.

‡ End of Controv. Letter xxxiv. p. 29.

§ P. 311.

tends that our method was invented to screen our practice of Idolatry with respect to images : we answer, that we follow the method of our predecessors in this respect, several centuries before the Calvinists and even the Iconoclasts raised any disturbances on the subject of images, as appears from S. Augustine, S. Jerom, &c.* and as there is no division or distinction of Commandments, nor even of verses or chapters, in the early Manuscripts of the Sacred text, we have no rule to be guided by in this respect, but the sense of it and ancient custom. Now as the First Commandment, however long and varied it is, in consequence of the proneness of the Jews to Idolatry, commands but one thing, namely, the service of the true God, and forbids but one thing, namely, the service of any false God, we naturally make but one commandment of it. On the other hand, as the Almighty was pleased to prohibit exterior and interior sins, in the same kind, by distinct commandments, so we naturally distinguish impure and avaricious desires, by separate prohibitions. It may be added, that Cranmer himself, in his Catechism, divided the Commandments as the Catholics do.† But, to give the Vicar his own way, for a short time, and to admit that the prohibition, *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing*, forms a distinct Commandment from the foregoing prohibition : *Thou shalt not have strange Gods before me* ; I should like to question him, what sense injurious to the Catholic belief and practice, he can extract from the former prohibition ? Does it forbid the making of images and representations altogether ? If so, then we must throw our money out of our pockets, and treat the King's figure disgracefully, as I mentioned a holy man did that of Copronimus, to convince him of his error.‡ Does it forbid the making of pious figures and representations in particular ? If so, then Moses was the first to transgress the law, and this by the command of God, given to him, in making two carved Cherubims to spread their wings over the Ark of the Covenant,§ whose example was followed by Solomon in several instances.|| What then was actually forbidden by those words : *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing &c.* ? The text itself immediately informs us, namely, *Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them*. But I have clearly proved that the Catholic Church condemns and anathematizes this practice, and every degree of it, as expressly and as strongly as the Vicar himself can do.—The Vicar being thus proved to be utterly

* Aug. Quost. in Exod. Hieron. in Ps. 32.

† Burnet's Hist. Ref. P. ii. p. 51.

‡ End of Controv. Let. xxxiv. p. 29.

§ Exod. xxv. 18.

3, alias 1 Kings, vi. 23, &c.

destitute of arguments to support this, his uncharitable and calumnious charge against the great majority of his fellow Christians as well as his countrymen, or to offer one plausible objection to the exculpatory evidence produced on their behalf, it is not too much to say that he himself does not believe in it. When the Duke of York, who was afterwards King James II., asked the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sheldon : " If it is *the Doctrine of the Church of England* that *R. Catholics are Idolaters*, he answered him, *It is not* ; but, said he : Young men of parts will be popular, and such a charge is the way to it."* There are, however, other inducements besides vanity, to induce clergymen, old as well as young, to belie the doctrine of their Church, and the dictates of their consciences. But, what a vile hypocrisy is this ! And what answer will they make before the assembled universe, when they will be arraigned on the breach of a commandment, which admits of no division, nor exception, nor qualification at all, namely, THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR ? To prevent this overwhelming confusion overtaking him, let the Vicar attend to the advice of the learned and candid Prebendary of Westminster, who warns his brethren : " Not to lead people by the nose, to believe they can prove Papists to be Idolaters, when they cannot."†

I am, yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XIX.

On Antichrist.

THERE can be no doubt but that the Vicar has gone beyond the wishes of his friends and patrons, in different parts of his book, and in no part of it more so than where he maintains that the Pope is *the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition*, described by St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3, and, in short, the identical *Antichrist*, mentioned by St. John, *who denieth the Father and the Son*, 1 John, ii. 22. A great proportion of our Nobility and Gentry have seen and conversed with the meek and edifying Pius VII., since his delivery from the six years' imprisonment, which he un-

* Burnet's Hist. of his Own Times, Vol. I. p. 358.

† Thorndyke. Just Weights and Measures.

derwent for refusing to proclaim a crusade against this country ;* and every one knows that his heroical predecessor, Pius VI., lost his life for opposing the measures of that impious faction, whose professed object was to exterminate Christianity out of the world. Nor is this all ; for when the Pope was restored to his property and power, he was chiefly indebted to the Sovereign of this country for the benefit. Accordingly our King has, ever since that event, kept a representative, with other accredited agents, at the Pope's Court,† and he continues to interchange good offices and friendship with him. Think, then, Dear Sir, what a *scandalum magnatum* it would be to say that *The Defender of the Faith and Supreme Head of the Church of England* had restored and continues to support the identical *Antichrist* ! But the fact is, that this infuriate cry of the Pope's being Antichrist, is, at the present day, chiefly confined to the Orangemen of Ireland, and a few other delirious sectaries of the lowest description.

The Vicar indeed tells his readers, that protestant writers have invariable ascribed the characteristic marks of Antichrist to the Chief Pastor of the Church of Rome."‡ How far this is true, let these readers judge from the following passage in the Sermon of a celebrated Preacher, in delivering the Warburton Lecture, founded for the express purpose of upholding the absurd and impious doctrine in question. The latter says : " It is to be lamented that the symbol of Protestantism, namely, that the Pope, or Church of Rome, is Antichrist, should have *fallen into disrepute*, and particularly that a man so supremely skilled in the nature of moral evidence, as the great Chancellor Clarendon was, should have regarded it as a judgment on those who have pretended to make the discovery (which, he says, may as reasonably be applied to any other person whom they do not love), that being many of them, in other arguments, men of parts and clear ratiocination, they no sooner entered and exercised themselves in this, than they immediately became perplexed and obscure, so that their nearest friends could not understand them."§ The truth of this observation I clearly showed in *The End*

* The first condition required of the Pope by Napoleon, in 1808, for preserving his dominions and freedom, was, that he should join in an alliance, offensive and defensive, with him, "according to a plan that was to be pointed out to him." This plan was mutually understood to be the proclamation of a crusade against England, in the hopes of stirring up the Catholics of Ireland to rebellion.

† The Baron Reden is now Ambassador from His Majesty, in quality of King of Hanover, at the Court of Rome ; John Park, Esq. is, or lately was, the British Consul there ; as is Charles Denis, Esq. at Civita Vecchia.

‡ Reply, p. 317.

§ Twelve Sermons by Dr. Halifax, Bishop of St. Asaph's, p. 27.

of *Controversy*, Letter xlv. So early as the reign of Charles I., Archbishop Laud struck out of a work of Bishop Hall's which he revised, the position that *the Pope is Antichrist*, maintaining that *this is not the doctrine of the Church of England*. He confirmed this position by the authority of the reigning King, also by that of James I., and by implication of Elizabeth.*—In treating this subject in *The End of Controversy*,† I exposed the contradictions of learned Protestants upon it. That *the Faith* of the Church of Rome, was *spoken of through the whole world*, in his time we are assured by St. Paul, Rom. i. 8 : the question then is, when she lost this faith, and when the successor of St. Peter, became *the Son of perdition*, the very *Antichrist*? I showed that some of those writers date the apostacy from the very time of the Apostles, while others defer it till the time of the Reformation, so called, an interval of near fifteen centuries. To this the Vicar replies : "What Dr. M. calls *contradictions*, should rather be called *disagreements* : "‡ nevertheless I adhere to my term, and maintain that those Protestants who, dating the reign of Antichrist at an early period, declare that S. Gregory, for example, or S. Leo, or S. Silvester was Antichrist, contradict those other Protestants, who, bringing the same down to later times, confess those Pontiffs to have been Saints.

To speak now of the signs of this son of perdition : it is certain, as St. Paul assures us, that his *revelation* will be preceded by a *revolt*, or apostacy, 2 Thess. ii. 3 ; and our Vicar is vain enough to boast that "Every page of his book is replete with evidence that the Church of Rome has apostatized, and departed from the faith once delivered to the Saints."§ But will any other person say this of the book, besides the author of it? Will his friends and patrons say that he has proved a single point he has treated of? No, Dear Sir, it is *not in evidence*, but in *assertion*, and that too frequently of the boasting kind, that the Vicar is accustomed to deal.—The present question being about *Apostacy*, as a mark of Antichrist and Socinianism, or a denial of the adorable Trinity and Incarnation, being Apostacy, by the Vicar's own confession,|| I challenged Dr. Porteus, and by implication himself, to the inquiry whether this was prevalent in my communion or in his? Or rather, I proved that the whole faith of S. Athanasius, together with what is called his Creed, is as firmly maintained and believed by every real Catholic throughout the world, at the present day, as it was by the Saint himself in the fourth century :¶ whereas, among the heads and most distinguished members of the different classes of Protes-

* Life of A. B. Laud, by Dr. Heylin.

‡ Reply, p. 317. § P. 153. || P. 320.

† Letter xlv.

¶ Let. xlv. p. 126.

tants, it is hard to find any who give proof of their being grounded in this foundation of Christianity: while very many of them openly impugn and blaspheme it! This was the field in which the Vicar ought to have met me, by way of proving the Pope's Apostacy, if he meant to argue, and not barely to assert. —I showed by many arguments that the second mark of Antichrist, namely, that he *opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God—showing himself that he is God*, is not more applicable to the Pope than the former. The Vicar contravenes my arguments, but without attempting to answer them; on the contrary he satisfies himself with asking: "Is not the assumption of universal dominion over kingdoms and nations an act of Antichristian arrogance, whether exercised by a Hildebrand or a Pius VII., and does it not exactly accord with what St. Paul says of him: *Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God?*"* To this question of the Vicar: I answer NO: because a Potentate may exalt himself above all other men, without opposing and exalting himself *above God*. And how does he attempt to prove this alleged "assumption of universal dominion over kingdoms and nations" on the part of the Pope?—He heaps together a great number of names and titles, by which, he says, the Pope has been called by different persons, some of them absurd and impious, some of them proper and pious, some of them real and others feigned.† In the mean time, what alone regards the present point, the Pope himself assumes no other title than that of *Servus servorum Dei*, Servant to the Servants of God.

The Vicar next aims a wound at the character of the present writer, which exemplifies his skill as a logician, and his candour as a man. He says: "With respect to the Pope's temporal power, Dr. M. is very reserved in his observations; but we may, however, collect his opinion from what Bellarmine, the great oracle of his Church advances on the subject."‡—This mode of *collecting my opinion*, on a subject which touches my principles of civil loyalty as a British subject, from the writings of a foreign writer, is of a piece with the rest of the Vicar's argumentation. In the mean time, it is proper he should know that he may find, in the Records of his Majesty's Courts, more direct and certain means of ascertaining what my principles are

* Reply, p. 319.

† It is utterly false that, in the Commentaries on the Canon Law, the Pope is called "Our Lord God." As to the title of *Vicar of Christ*, on which the Vicar chiefly *harps*, I presume that when he preaches in his Church at Templebodane, he professes to announce the *word of Christ*, and therefore claims to speak as *his Vicar*.

‡ P. 321.

with respect to the Pope's temporal power in this kingdom, than he can discover in Bellarmine: or, without consulting the Records, he may get complete information on the point in *The End of Controversy* itself, P. iii. p. 163. I shall say nothing here of two other marks of Antichrist, *Miracles* and *Persecution*, which the Vicar ascribes to the Pope, as I shall soon have to treat in particular of them; nor will I disturb his pleasing dreams that the parish church of Templebodane is superior to the Basilick of the Vatican, "*superfluously decked*," as he considers the latter to be, and thereby affording "a token of Antichrist's kingdom."*

The Vicar's only remaining proof of the Pope's being Antichrist, consists in his anagram of the word *λατρινος*, from which he professes to extract the number of the beast 666.† Now, supposing the Vicar could expound his riddle to the satisfaction of all the learned men in Christendom, as well as his own, what would he prove thereby, except that his own orders, hierarchy, liturgy, Cathedral and Abbey Churches, together with our common Christianity, are all derived from Antichrist! Nay, he will be forced to confess he himself, at the present time, is *a member of Antichrist*, since he is confessedly not *a Greek*, but *a Latin* Christian! Regardless, however, of consequences, though absurd as well as impious, the Vicar concludes his chapter as he began it, with emphatically declaring: "That the Pope is ANTICHRIST."

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XX.

The Supremacy.

DEAR SIR:—The effect of strong bigotry, or prejudice is two-fold: one is to blind the understanding to the clearest evidence in opposition to it; the other is to deaden the sentiment, so as to render the mind indifferent whether the opinion it is determined to adhere to, be true or false. I leave you to judge for yourself, in which of these unfortunate predicaments the Vicar was, when, copying the latitudinarian Tillotson,‡ he wrote

* P. 320.

† P. 323.

‡ A. B. Tillotson was the son of an Anabaptist, and in all probability was never baptized: the entry of his name in the register of Sowerby, in Yorkshire, which his biographer Birch refers to, having, in all probability, been

as follows : " The Pope's Supremacy, is not only an indefensible, but an *impudent* cause : There is not one tolerable argument for it, and there are a thousand invincible reasons against it."* Strange it would be, if this were so, that all the greatest and best Christians in every country should have been dupes to *an impudent cause that has not one tolerable argument for it, and a thousand invincible reasons against it*, till the beginning of the sixteenth century, when an infuriate friar in Germany, and a libidinous Prince in England, discovered this impudence ! And on what occasions did they make these discoveries ? Why, indeed, it was on occasion of Pope Leo's censuring some heterodox positions of the former respecting Indulgences, Good Works, Free Will, &c., and of Pope Clement's refusing to divorce the latter from his lawful wife, with whom he had lived twenty years, to enable him to marry her maid of honour.

I do, and must consider it as a proof either of the stone-blindness or insensible obduracy of the Rev. Vicar, that he does not perceive so much as *a tolerable argument* for the Pope's or even for St. Peter's Supremacy in Christ's emphatical words to the latter, when he first saw him : *Thou art Simon the son of Jona : thou shalt be called Cepha, which is interpreted PETER, or a ROCK.* John, i. 42 : nor even in those other words to him on a subsequent occasion : *Blessed art thou, Simon, the son of Jona, because flesh and blood have not revealed this* (the knowledge of Christ's Divinity) *to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven. And I say to thee : Thou art Peter* (or a Rock,) *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, &c.* Mat. xvi. 18. I omit the other Scriptural texts to the same purpose, which are quoted in *The End of Controversy*.† To the irresistible force of these Scriptural proofs, the Vicar opposes the most feeble objections. He alleges first, that " Although Peter had been the *Rock* on which

foisted into it, after his high promotion. On the other hand, his alleged ordination by a Scotch Bishop, in England, is more than suspicious. His connexions in early life were chiefly among the Puritans : with them he assisted at Cromwell's death, when the chief of them, Dr. Goodwin, blasphemously reproached the Almighty with having *deceived him*, as likewise at the Conferences at the Savoy. Every one knows, that, being called upon to attend Lord Russel at his death, he absolutely insisted upon his confessing the doctrine of *Non-Resistance*, as a condition *necessary for his salvation*, and that, very soon after this, he accepted of the Primacy of which the consistent Sancroft had been deprived, for adhering to that doctrine of his Church. His favourite author was " the incomparable Chillingworth," as he called him, who upon deserting the Catholic Religion, like other deserters of that description, became a decided latitudinarian.

* Reply, p. 326.

† Letter xli. p. 135.

the Church was built, yet, that this Church was not the Church of Rome, but the Church of Jerusalem.”* Just as if Christ, in speaking of the Church which he was to build on Peter, and against which the forces of Hell should not prevail, meant the congregation of any particular city, and not the whole Catholic Church! The Vicar objects, secondly, that St. Paul says, 2 Cor. xi. 5, *I am not a whit behind the chief of the Apostles*. I answer that the Apostle clearly speaks of his ministry, as a preacher of the Gospel, not of his rank or authority as an Apostle. He objects, thirdly, that St. Paul withstood St. Peter, when he withdrew himself from the company of the Gentiles at Antioch, Galat. ii. 11. True; and so may every inferior withstand a superior, when by too much condescension the latter exposes the Church to danger. He objects, fourthly, that *There was a strife among the Apostles at the last supper, which of them should seem greater*. Luke, xxii. 24. No wonder, Dear Sir, when you reflect that St. Andrew was the first disciple, S. Matthew the best educated among them, St. John the best beloved: besides this, St. Peter had not then received his commission. But what trifling is all this, together with the rest of the Vicar’s objections against St. Peter’s supremacy! such as his falling asleep in the garden, his momentary weakness in denying Christ, his beginning to sink when he walked on the water, &c.

The superiority of St. Peter being established, the next question is, whether this descended to his successors in the See of Rome. The Vicar admits that “There are strong grounds for supposing that St. Peter was at Rome the year preceding his martyrdom.”† But, Sir, if credit is to be given to the Ancient Fathers and Church Historians, such as Tertullian, SS. Irenæus, Athanasius, Chrysostom,‡ Jerom, Leo, Eusebius, &c., we have something better than the Vicar’s *supposition* for this fact: we have irrefragable evidence of St. Peter’s having been at Rome, and having governed the Church there many years. The Vicar next objects that the Popes do not succeed to St. Peter “as Apostles, because,” says he, “they do not inherit the miracu-

* Reply, p. 327.

† Reply, p. 331.

‡ S. Chrysostom was a native of Antioch, and a Priest of that Church, before he became Bishop of C. P. His testimony, in the former capacity, is no less weighty than it is clear in this matter. What he says is this: “It is one of the privileges of our City (Antioch) to have had for its master, St. Peter, Chief of the Apostles. It was just that the City, which first bore the name of *Christian*, should have for its Pastor the first of the Apostles. But having enjoyed that happiness, we would not engross it to ourselves, but delivered him to Rome, the imperial city.” Hom. 12. Tom. v.

lous gifts of the Apostles.”* But first, what Catholic ever pretended that the Popes, after St. Peter, were Apostles? I answer, not one of them. It is enough for them to have succeeded to the See in which St. Peter finally established the Supremacy. In the next place, with respect to the *miraculous gifts*, it might be expected that the Vicar would have learnt from the Acts and St. Paul’s Epistles, that so far from their being peculiar to the Apostles, they were possessed in the Apostolic age not only by the Deacons, but also by the faithful in general.†

The Vicar’s usual chicanery accompanies his remarks on the testimonies of the ancient Fathers in behalf of the Pope’s supremacy. I quoted the illustrious Bishop and Martyr of the second century on this head, who says: “we confound all heretics by the tradition of the greatest, most ancient, and universally known Church, which was founded at Rome by the glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, to which every Church is bound to conform by reason of its superior authority.”‡ This testimony the Vicar tries to elude, by saying that “as Rome was the capital of the Empire, it follows that the Church of Rome would acquire an ascendancy among the Churches of the Empire! But, Milan, Aquileia, and other cities afterwards were the capitals, without acquiring this ascendancy. He next says, that Irenæus has asserted what is false, “in saying it (the Church of Rome) was the most *ancient*, because the establishment of the Church of Jerusalem was *antecedent to it*!”§ Proceeding to notice Tertullian, S. Cyprian, and the other Fathers whom I cited, as bearing testimony to the Supremacy of the Roman See, the Vicar makes an effort to extricate himself from his embarrassment with saying, “that their opinion in all probability depended on the authority of Irenæus!”|| So then it was S. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, in the middle of the second century, who misled the other Fathers from S. Ignatius in the first century, down to Venerable Bede in the eighth,¶ with all the other Fathers and Councils during that interval (whose testimonies

* P. 335.

† Acts, vi. 8. Acts, viii. 6. 1 Cor. xii. 30, &c.

‡ Lib. iii. contra Hæres.

§ Reply, p. 333.

|| P. 334.

¶ End of Controv., Letter xlv, p. 138, &c. The great St. Athanasius, who was Bishop of the second See in the world, that of Alexandria, calls the Church of Rome: “The mother and head of all other Churches.” S. Ambrose, Bishop of the then Imperial city of Milan, commends his brother Satyrus for questioning the Bishop, on his landing in Sardinia: “Whether he was in communion with the Catholic Bishops, that is, with the Church of Rome.” S. Augustin, speaking of certain dissensions in Africa, says: “The Acts of the Councils concerning them have been sent to Rome, and are come back from thence. *The cause is finished: God grant the error may finish also.*”

would fill a large volume,) 'to acknowledge the successor of S. Peter in the See of Rome as head of the Church! It would be wasting time and ink to argue the point further with such a theologian. In short, the whole of what the Vicar has been able to collect from the Fathers, in opposition to their numerous and convincing declarations on this head, consists in certain praises which S. Chrysostom bestows on S. Paul: he says, for example, "no one is greater than S. Paul;" speaking of his *merit* not his *rank*. Again: "the whole world was given to St. Paul:" yes, to *preach in*. "As he laboured more abundantly than the other Apostles, so he will be more abundantly rewarded."* No doubt S. Chrysostom expressed his conviction in this particular, which however did not prevent him from appealing to Pope Innocent's supremacy, for the purpose of setting aside an unjust sentence of deposition against himself, pronounced by an Episcopal cabal in the East, under the influence of the Empress Eudoxia.

On the subject of Councils, the Vicar reproaches me with "laying great stress on the Council of Sardis (*as he calls it*), which confirmed the Bishop of Rome in the right of receiving appeals from all the Churches in the world." He adds: "the authority of that Council is considered dubious, and its laws spurious, by the most eminent writers; still the plea for assuming supreme jurisdiction in the universal Church must be very weak which only depends on the decrees of one obscure Council."† Observe, dear Sir, the numerous blunders which our Vicar crowds together in one short paragraph; for, first, he confounds together the city of *Sardis* in Lydia, mentioned in the Revelations, c. iii. v. 1, with that of *Sardica* in Illyricum: secondly, if the laws of any Council are *spurious*, its authority is evidently *not dubious*, but positively *null*: thirdly, there is no *writer of any eminence*, who has *considered* the Canons of the Council of *Sardica* as *spurious*: lastly, this Council so far from being an *obscure* one, ranks as a *general Council of the Church*, having been collected out of thirty-five different provinces, and consisting of near three hundred Bishops,‡ among whom were the representatives of the British Churches, Restitutius, Bishop of London, Eborius of York, and Adelphius, of *Colonia Londinensium*, whether this was Colchester, Maldon, or Verulam.§

* Reply, p. 334.

† See End of Controv., Letter xlv. p. 140. Reply, p. 339.

‡ Socrates and Sozomen make them amount to three hundred Western Bishops, exclusive of the Eastern Prelates. St. Athanasius reckons only one hundred and seventy, exclusive of the Eusebians.

§ S. Athanasius, in his Apology, bears testimony to the fact of the Council of Sardica, in which the Pope's supreme authority was recognized, be

The Vicar having referred to the general Council of Nice, can. vi, as if that contained something to his purpose; I shall barely observe that this is not the case; as the Canon in question orders nothing more than that the ancient rule be observed, namely, that the Bishops of Africa be confirmed, or instituted by the Patriarch of Alexandria, and those of Asia by the Patriarch of Antioch, in the manner, it says, those of Europe are by the Pope. This discipline was perfectly reconcilable with the claim of the last-mentioned to a general supremacy. Should the Vicar wish to see something more express on this point from a general Council, he has but to peruse the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, where the assembled Bishops, giving an account of what they had done, in a letter to Pope Leo, thus say to him: "you presided over our Council, as a head over its Members, by means of those legates who held your place."*

Most Protestant polemics, who have preceded the Vicar, in speaking of S. Gregory the Great's disclaiming for himself, as well as denying to the Patriarch of C. P., the title *œcumenical* or *universal* Bishop, have represented him as disclaiming all *authority* and *jurisdiction* over other Bishops; but, owing, probably, to the irrefragable proofs, produced in my work to the contrary, particularly in his subjecting all the British and Scotch Bishops, to his legate S. Augustin,† the Vicar gives up this argument, and confesses that if "the lordly pretensions of John (of C. P.) were suspicious, the counter-pretensions of Gregory were still more so."‡ Another objection, however, of those polemics, and allied to it, he has displayed in all its deformity, where he says: "It was reserved for the succeeding age to see the unprincipled Phocas, after the murder of his master, transfer the title of *universal Bishop* from the Eastern Patriarch to the Roman Pontiff."§ It is unnecessary to expose the other falsehoods contained or supposed in this passage, when it is clear from their records and history, that the Popes, from the period in question to the present day, never have claimed or acknow-

ing attended by British Prelates: which fact alone crushes to atoms the Bishop of St. David's laboured system. In addition to this his Lordship will find, on examination, that the same representatives of the British Churches attended the great Council of Arles, in which the Roman computation of Easter was established; see Labbe's Councils, T. 1. p. 1430. It was not till after the intercourse of the British and Irish Churches with the Roman See was broken off by the Saxon invaders and pirates, that these Churches fell into a wrong computation of that festival: which error, however, was different from that of the Eastern Quartodecimans, and peculiar to themselves.

* Labbe, t. iv. p. 833.

† End of Controv., Letter xlv. p. 142.

‡ Reply, p. 340.

§ Ibid.

ledged the title of *œcumenical*, "lest, as Bellarmin observes, they should appear to deny that there are any other Bishops besides themselves."*

The remainder of the Vicar's fifteenth chapter is made up of loose declamation, invidious falsehood, and ridiculous cries of Victory. True it is, I told Dr. Porteus and his fellow writers, that "if they could succeed in proving that Christ had not built his Church upon St. Peter and his successors, it would still remain for them to prove that he had founded any part of it on Henry VIII., Edward VI., and their successors, or that they had received any greater power from Christ over the doctrine and discipline of the Church, than he conferred on Tiberias, Pilate, or Herod." Now, instead of meeting this argument like a theologian or a scholar, he maliciously distorts it to the prejudice of my loyalty, and attachment to my Sovereign, as if I compared his Majesty, a just and benevolent Christian King, with the above-mentioned infidel and sanguinary tyrants! Neither did I in my plate of the Apostolic Tree,† exhibit any living character, nor so much as my personal calumniator,‡ as one of those withered and broken branches, which our Saviour describes as destined to the flames: John, xv. 6. Because I know full well the power of divine grace, which can revive and ingraft him into the living vine of the Catholic Church in a moment of time, as it did St. Paul, while I am conscious that I myself may deserve to be cut off from it, like a second Judas. Another falsehood of the Vicar is, that I "repeated the vile fabrication of the Nag's-head affair!" on which subject he vents his utmost spleen; declaring me more guilty in so doing than was his redoubted adversary, Ward, the author of *The Errata*. Now, dear Sir, the truth is, that I never once mentioned or alluded to the *Nag's-head affair*, throughout the whole of my work; so that whatever fabrication there is in the business, it attaches to the Rev. Vicar.

The Vicar finishes the present subject in the following strains of mock triumph and self-applause: "Thus is the Supremacy of the Pope discarded by every authority, ancient and modern. I have proved that it is anti-scriptural; that it is not borne out by any thing that St. Peter says of himself, nor by any special authority delegated to him by our Saviour, &c."§ Such is the testimony which the Vicar bears to his own performance: but

* De Rom. Pont. l. ii. c. 31.

† It is evident how much the plate of the *Apostolical Tree* annoys the Vicar; and yet it is Christ himself, as I have shown, who furnished the first idea of it. Tertullian dilates that idea, which having done, he exclaims:

"Confingant tale aliquid hæretici." *Præscrip. Contra Hæret.*

‡ See his Answer to Ward.

§ Reply, p. 349.

will any respectable and learned friend of his confirm it with his signature ; or attest that he appears to have proved any one single position, among the many which he has advanced in his pretended *Reply to the End of Controversy* ? So far from doing this, I am persuaded that every such friend of the Rev. Gentleman will seriously advise him, for the credit of his cause, as well as of his character, to avoid in his future publications such extravagant assertions as that which he made at the beginning of his chapter, namely, that "The Pope's Supremacy is an impudent cause, which has not one tolerable argument for it ;" and such revolting brag as that with which he concludes it, namely, that he has "discarded this Supremacy, by every authority, ancient and modern." That there is *impudence* on one side or the other is unquestionable. You, Dear Sir, and your fellow-readers will judge on which side it lies.

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XXI.

On Religious Persecution.

DEAR SIR ;—In attacking my letter on this subject, in *The End of Controversy*, the Rev. Vicar has, according to his usual method, misrepresented both the nature and the object of it. It is very remote from the author's disposition to delight in scenes of cruelty, and therefore it is a calumny to say of him, as the Vicar does, that he treats with more "*than ordinary satisfaction* of religious persecution, and of fires, stakes, faggots, axes, knives, halters, gibbets, racks and tortures."* The fact is, that having to answer B. Porteus, and a whole host of his associate controvertists and preachers, whose customary and most popular argument against the Catholic Religion is to represent it as a sanguinary system, that persecutes upon principle, concealing in the mean time the persecutions of Protestants against Catholics, and against one another, in these circumstances there appeared to be but one effectual method of stopping the pens and the mouths of these inflammatory writers and declaimers, which consisted in proving to them that persecution has been more

* Reply, p. 351.

extensively and cruelly exercised by Protestants against Catholics, than by Catholics against Protestants. Accordingly I adopted this method both in *The Letters to a Prebendary* and *The End of Controversy*; not from any satisfaction I felt in treating of those melancholy subjects, but from "a wish to cut off one of the most virulent sources of religious acrimony, and promoting conciliation and peace," between the contending parties, as I signified on both those occasions.* Nor does it seem that the method was unsuccessful, either with Dr. Sturges,† or with the present defender of Dr. Porteus: for certainly I cannot attribute to any other cause than the demonstrative proofs I brought of the persecuting principles and practices of Protestants of every denomination, in every country in which they have obtained an ascendancy, during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, that the Vicar expresses a willingness "to draw a veil over the disgusting subject" of persecution.‡ I agree to the proposal, whatever may be his motive for making it; still reserving to myself, however, the right of refuting some very acrimonious and false charges against me and the cause I defend, which he brings in the very act of professing his wish to "cultivate the feelings of mutual charity and forbearance."§

The Vicar reproaches me with not having mentioned, in my Letter on Persecution, in *The End of Controversy*, "the intolerance of Charles IX. and Lewis XIV., or the bloody tribunals of the Duke of Alva." The case is, my subject did not lead me to speak of these, but rather of the persecutions which Catholics had endured at the hands of Protestants, for the purpose, as I expressed, of balancing the account of bloodshed between the two parties, and of closing it for ever. And, though I have not expressly treated of these subjects in *The End of Controversy*, I have there referred to my former work, *The Letters to a Prebendary*, where they are, each of them, discussed at considerable length. The Vicar adds: "When speaking of Queen Elizabeth, he (Dr. M.) details with circumstantial minuteness the cruelties she inflicted on two hundred Catholics, whom she got hanged, drawn, and quartered, for the mere exercise of the Religion of their ancestors:" although he is conscious that those persons suffered, "not because of their belief in Popish doctrines, but because their zeal to restore Popery led them to rebel against her government."|| Foul calumniator! so far from being conscious of this, I have proved

* Letters to a Preb. iv. p. 84, sixth Edit. End of Controv., Let. xlix, p. 173.

† See the Second Edit. of Reflections on Popery by Dr. Sturges.

‡ Reply, p. 352.

§ Ibid.

|| P. 251.

the contrary from the confessions and conduct of the conscientious and loyal sufferers in question,* from the tenor of the different Acts of Parliament and Proclamations which took place in that reign,† and from the acknowledgment of that unfeeling Queen herself, as reported by her feed historian.‡

The Vicar now passes to political subjects, in which, however, he does not seem to be better versed than in those of theology. I mentioned that unparalleled machination of villainy and absurdity, hatched by Lord Shaftesbury and the Doctors Tongue and Oates, against the whole Catholic body, and which actually spilt the blood of Lord Stafford and eighteen other loyal Catholics; and I showed that one effect of the national delirium, produced by this plot, was the passing of the *impracticable Test Act*, and the *unintelligible Declaration against Popery*.§ Now the Vicar, instead of vindicating the character of those his heroes, or the reality of their plot, asserts on the bare authority of *his own word*, that "Were it not for those impregnable barriers," as he calls them, "there would be no established Church to defend."|| He then goes on to remind the distinguished advocates of Popish aggrandizement, who have joined Dr. M. in denouncing the Parliamentary *Declaration against Popery* as *unnecessary*, of certain passages in the Homilies, Articles, and Rubricks, which describe the Catholic Religion as superstitious, false, and idolatrous."¶ Just as if the abolition of the Test, and the Declaration, before the existence of which the Established Church flourished much more than it has done since, were the abolition of this Church itself! With equal force of argument, the Vicar states the opposition of Catholics to *the Veto*, and the publication of certain Catholic works of controversy, and lastly, the present Pope's reprobation of mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants, as so many arguments against the abolition of the Acts grounded on Oates's Plot!*** With respect to the *Test Act* in particular, I pronounced it *impracticable*, and therefore no barrier to the Established Church. In fact, it no sooner passed, than the Dissenters eluded it by means of occa-

* See the genuine history of all the plots, real or fabricated, during Elizabeth's reign, in *Letters to a Prebendary*, Letter vi. N.B. In the above list of two hundred sufferers for their Religion, John Felton, who denied Elizabeth's title to the throne, and Babington, Ballard, &c. implicated in a real conspiracy, are not included.

† 1 Eliz. c. i. 5 Eliz. c. i. 13 Eliz. c. ii. 23 Eliz. c. i., &c.

‡ Camden testifies of her as follows: "Plerosque ex misellis his Sacerdotibus exitii in patriam conflandi consocios fuisse non credidit. Importunis precibus evicta permisit ut Edmundus Campianus, &c. judicio sisterentur." *Annales*, Eliz. Anno 1581.

§ End of Controv. Let. xlix. p. 187.

|| Reply, p. 353.

¶ Ibid.

** P. 354.

sional conformity ; and accordingly, the Army, the Navy, the Corporations, and the Ministry itself, have ever since been indiscriminately filled with them.* On the other hand, a practical dispensation from the Test, by an annual Act for this purpose, is found to be necessary, with respect to the members of the Established Church themselves (not one in a thousand of whom ever take it), to prevent the dissolution of the Army and Navy.—I quoted Swift, as asserting that *a disqualifying law on account of Religion*, is a degree of *religious persecution*.† The Vicar answers me with copious citations from him against both Catholics and Dissenters. But, once more I say, it is not my business, nor is it in my power to make Protestant writers consistent with themselves. We all know, for example, how pointedly Swift ridiculed the differences between the Established Church and the Dissenters; in his account of the two nations that went to war with each other about the practice of breaking their eggs at the *big end* or the *little end*: yet with all his keen sarcasm on both the *big-endians* and the *little-endians*, he is proved to be as violent a big-endian as the most zealous of his nation.

Instead then of buttressing up those disgraceful monuments of England's phrenzy, as "the barriers of the Established Church," let the Rev. Vicar devise some means, if he can, of causing all his brethren to believe and support the articles of their of own Church, especially the fundamental articles of our common Christianity, the *Trinity* and the *Incarnation*. Next, let him exert himself in stopping the course of that *Bibliomania*, which is evidently and rapidly sapping its foundations. Lastly, as far as he dreads the influence of the Catholic Religion, persuaded as he is of the victorious nature of his *Reply*, let him engage his patrons (instead of endeavouring to suppress the present work, as they did the *Letters to a Prebendary*) to get it, or else *The End of Controversy*, printed and published in parallel letters with it: for what chance has ignorance in a combat with truth; bigotry with reasoning; idolatry and blasphemy with pure Christianity!

J. M., D.D.

* It is credibly reported that His late Majesty having asked his Minister, the great Henry Dundas, whether he had qualified himself for office, as a member of the Church of England? He answered, that he was a Deacon of the Church of Scotland, and ever would remain so.

† Let. xlix. p. 187.

LETTER XXII.

On Miracles.

DEAR SIR :—In treating of the characters or marks of the True Church, in *The Second Part of The End of Religious Controversy*, I mentioned, of course, the character of *Holiness*, which is ascribed to it in the Apostles' Creed, where every Christian is taught to say : *I believe in the HOLY Catholic Church*. This distinctive mark of *Holiness* I proved to belong to that Church, which I showed, at the same time, to be distinctively ONE, distinctively CATHOLIC, and distinctively APOSTOLICAL. The *Holiness itself* I showed to consist, first, in the purity of her *doctrine* ; secondly, in the *peculiar means* she possesses, of attaining to sanctity ; thirdly, in the *fruits* of sanctity, namely, all the saints in the calendar and other persons, who in every age and country have been most conspicuous for their Christian virtues : lastly, in the Divine *attestation* of her sanctity in the *Miracles* with which God has not ceased from time to time, to illustrate exclusively her communion. The three other marks of the true Church, the Vicar, in a great measure overlooks, or, at least, mentions them without much emotion ; but the claim to a succession of miracles in the Catholic Church, puts him out of all patience, as it does most other Protestants. This appears from his introduction of this subject, where he writes as follows : “ It is painful to think that, in the present enlightened age, a gentleman like Dr. M., who displays learning in almost every department of science, who possesses experience, intelligence, and taste, who writes well and reasons acutely ; should be so *besotted* as not only to believe himself, but attempt to induce others to believe all the stupid legends of the dark ages, and the modern fabrications of the same stamp. Such fatuity would be a miracle in itself, were it not known how superstition debases the reason, when it has gained the ascendant over the mind.”* In return, the present author says, that such lofty compliments as the Vicar pays him might tempt him to a degree of vanity, did not the Rev. gentleman evince a total absence of mind in paying them, in as much as he ascribes to me *a belief in all the stupid legends of the dark ages, and modern fabrications of the same stamp* ; whereas, in the very passage he refers to, I have distinctly avowed that “ A vast

* Reply, p. 361.

number of incredible and false miracles, as well as other fables, have been forged and believed in every age of the Church, including that of the Apostles." Some writers, who have dealt most largely in these articles, I have reprobated by name. In conclusion, however, I argued thus: "Are we to deny the truth of all history, because there are numberless false histories? And are we to question the four Evangelists, because there have been several fabricated Gospels? Most certainly not: but we are to make use of the discernment which God has given us, to distinguish false documents and accounts of every kind from those which are true: and we ought to employ double diligence in examining alleged revelations and events, *contrary* to the general laws of nature."* I would appeal to the Vicar's best friends whether this language of the author shows him to be so *besotted* and *debased in reason*, as to believe all the stupid legends of the dark ages and modern fabrications of the same stamp!

You know, Dear Sir, as does every other reader of the Old and New Testaments, that the whole history of God's people is one tissue of Miracles. Moses and the other Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, wrought numberless Miracles, and appealed to these in proof of their Mission, and the truths which they announced. So far from leading us to expect a cessation of Miracles, our Divine master has expressly told us: *If any man believeth in me, the works that I do he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do.* John, xiv. 12. All this I stated at greater length in *The End of Controversy*. Now what answer does the enlightened Vicar make to my *besotted fatuity* in his boasted *Reply*? No answer at all. Conformably with this sacred promise, I showed, on the same occasion, that the Almighty had continued to illustrate his true Church, from time to time, with unquestionable miracles, even down to this age of prevailing Sadducism. In proof of this, I cited or referred to the most illustrious Fathers and historians of the ancient Church, who unanimously vouch for the continuation of miracles, and to the most credible writers of later ages, whose testimony on this point is equally uniform. I showed, moreover, that those Fathers who undertook to defend the ancient faith against the heresies of their times, for example, S. Irenæus, Tertullian, S. Pacian, S. Augustin, Nicetas, Bede, &c., constantly appealed to the miracles wrought in the Catholic Church, in proof of that faith; denying at the same time, that miracles were wrought in any other communion. What answer does the Vicar make to all these arguments? He says, in the first place, that "the coming of the man of sin will be after the working of Satan, in all

* End of Controv. Letter xxiv. p. 112.

power, and signs, and wonders." This objection, if it proved any thing, would prove that the Samaritans ought to have disbelieved the miracles of the Deacon Philip, because Simon Magus had *bewitched them with his magic*, Acts, viii. 11; and Pharaoh ought to have hardened his heart against the true miracles of Moses, because his magicians wrought several lying wonders! The Vicar's second resource consists in nibbling at some of the miracles I reported from the ancient Fathers and historians. He begins with that mentioned by the Apostolic Father S. Ignatius, of the wild beasts being often withheld by a divine power from devouring or hurting the Christian Martyrs who were exposed to them. The Vicar will not allow this to have been a miracle, and says that, in these cases, "the beasts were terrified at the sight of the surrounding spectators, and so refused to fight."* An infidel will account in the same way, or in one just as plausible, for the *shutting up of the mouths of the lions*, Heb. xi. 33; mentioned by St. Paul, and which he attributes to the faith of the Prophets. But we have the testimony of an unimpeachable eye witness of the miracles in question.

The father of Church-history, Eusebius, describing the combats of the Martyrs in Palestine, under the persecution of Dioclesian, says that he himself was an eye-witness at Tyre in Phœnicia, when those beasts, which had been kept without food for a long time, to render them voracious, and which were goaded with red hot iron to make them furious, being turned loose upon the devoted Christians, did not dare to approach to them, but, being repelled by a divine power, turned back from them. In the mean time they turned their fury upon their keepers, and dealt destruction among the infidels.† The Vicar passes over the numerous *false or Popish miracles*, as he calls them, which I referred to as having been wrought by S. Gregory, sur-named *Thaumaturgus*, and such as are attested by SS. Irenæus, Cyprian, or Origen. He mentions, however, and acknowledges the miracle which defeated the Emperor Julian's attempts to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, not for the numerous and high testimonies which support it, but for the consequences which would result from denying it.‡ In fact, this is the Vicar's, as it was Dr. Middleton's criterion of miracles. As, therefore, he can do without the splendid miracle of Typasus, where a whole congregation of Catholics, whose tongues had been cut

* Reply, p. 363.

† See a detailed account of this frequent miracle in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, Book viii. c. 7. See also the highly interesting account of the martyrdom of SS. Tarachus, Probus, and Andronicus, in Ruinart's Genuine Acts, or in Alban Butler's Lives of the Saints. October 11.

‡ Reply, p. 364.

out to the roots, by the Arian tyrant Hunnerio, were enabled to speak as before, though equally well attested, he denies it. In speaking of this, the Vicar charges me with a fraud, in concealing that "two of the number *remained dumb*:" in return, I charge him with a fraud in saying they *remained dumb*, whereas it is clear from the historian Procopius, that they *recovered their speech*, with their companions, and were only *deprived of it* on their keeping bad company, and falling into a carnal sin, which circumstance evidently *heightens the miracle*.

With the same indifference, as in the foregoing case, does the Rev. Gentleman pass by unnoticed the express testimonies of SS. Basil, Athanasius, Jerom, Chrysostom, Augustin, of Hippo, &c., which I either quoted or referred to,* for numberless miracles, wrought some of them in their presence, and the rest within their knowledge, together with those of all the original historians. He is pleased, however, to notice what I said of the miracles of our Apostle, S. Augustin of Canterbury; but, whereas I said that these were recorded on his tomb, as having been instrumental in the conversion of our ancestors, and were compared by Pope S. Gregory, in a letter to the Patriarch of Antioch, for their number and splendour, with those of the Apostles themselves, and that they were likewise mentioned by the same Pope, in a letter to St. Augustin himself, with a caution against his taking pride in them,† the Vicar is pleased to notice only one of them, namely, his restoring sight to a blind man, in the presence of the Welsh Bishops; and this he attempts to undermine, by asking whether it convinced those Bishops, and induced them "to admit the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome?"‡ I answer this question of the Rev. Gentleman, by proposing another question in point: Did the same miracle, wrought by Christ on the man born blind, or did even the resurrection of Lazarus, who had been four days in his grave, convert the Scribes and Pharisees? With his usual adroitness the Vicar skips over the countless and well attested miracles of S. Bernard, in the twelfth century,§ and of the other Saints I have referred to, in order to cavil at those of a holy personage, whose name ought never to be mentioned by him without blushing. I speak of the great St. Francis Xavierius, the Apostle of the Indies. The plain case is this: the miracles of this wonderful missionary have been, and are still celebrated throughout India, where he, by his personal labours, under God, converted above a hundred thousand Pagans to Christianity, as well as throughout

* End of Controv. Let. xxiii, p. 76.

† Ibid. p. 78.

‡ Reply, p. 367.

§ End of Controv. Letter xxiii. p. 79.

Europe, ever since his death, in 1552, and have always been, together with the miracles of the other Saints, a grievous eyesore to Protestant polemics. At length Dr. Douglas, the late learned and acute Bishop of Salisbury, wrote and published his *Criterion of Miracles*, for the express purpose of disproving the miracles wrought in the Catholic Church, and of demonstrating that "the miracles ascribed to Popish Saints are forgeries of an age posterior to that they lay claim to." In proof of this, he brings what he calls, "conclusive evidence that, during thirty-five years from the death of Xavier, his miracles had not been heard of. The evidence," he says, "I shall allege, is that of Acosta (Joseph Acosta,) who himself had been a missionary among the Indians. His work, *De Procuranda Indorum Salute*, was printed in 1589, that is, above thirty-seven years after the death of Xavier; and in it we find an express acknowledgment that *no miracles had ever been performed by missionaries among the Indians*. Acosta was himself a Jesuit, and therefore from his silence we may infer, unexceptionably, that between thirty and forty years had elapsed before Xavier's miracles were thought of."* This pretended *conclusive evidence* of the celebrated *Detector Douglas*, as he was called, has been echoed and re-echoed by the Rev. Le Mesurier, Hugh Farmer, Peter Roberts, and every Protestant writer on miracles, whom I have met with, down to the Rev. R. Grier, who, in again trumpeting it, sins against the *conviction*, which the evidence of Bishop Douglas's error, contained in *The End of Controversy*, must have produced in him. In fact, I produced the commission of the King of Portugal to his Viceroy in India, Don Francisco Baretto, dated May 28, 1556, within three years and four months from the death of the Saint, in which the King charges him "to take depositions upon oath, in all parts of India, concerning these miracles."† This fact refutes at once Dr. Douglas's conclusive evidence of their not being heard of for thirty-five years after the death of S. Xaverus. But, in the second place, I quoted the words of the identical Joseph Acosta, from the very work referred to by his Lordship, in which he distinctly says this: "even in our own time miracles, too numerous to be counted, have taken place both in the East and the West-Indies." He afterwards says, speaking of "the man of our age, the blessed Master Francis," as S. Xaverus was called before his canonization: "So many and such great signs are

* *Criterion of Miracles*, p. 73.

† This Commission is extant in *Emanuel Acosta's Historia Rerum in Oriente Gestarum*, published at Dillingen in 1571, and at Paris in 1572, that is, within twenty years after the Saint's death; likewise in Tursellinus's early History of the Saint.

reported of him by many, and those proper witnesses, that hardly so many are reported of any one except the Apostles.”* I had long known that Bishop Douglas and his followers falsified the work of Acosta, but I wished to find the latter in some library of public access; at length I found it in the Bodleyan Library at Oxford, where I said it might be seen any day, by inquiring for it under the title which I set down.† What excuse, I now ask, can the Vicar devise for his deliberate prevarication, in continuing to assert, that “Acosta makes no mention of Xavier’s miracles!”‡ and that “forty years elapsed, after Xavier’s death, before his miracles were thought of!”§ Respecting the meaning of the word *facultas*, I will not dispute with him: || this being a matter within his own province; though I am inclined to prefer Ainsworth’s authority to his, who renders that word: *easiness, quickness, aptness, readiness, promptness*.

Respecting the recent supernatural cures mentioned by me, the Vicar says: “We can perceive no alteration in the course of nature, no effect above human means to accomplish, and no evidence of a divine agency; we can trace them all to natural causes.”¶ Accordingly he attributes the sudden restoration to health and strength of a man, lame from a grievous injury, if not a fracture of the *spina dorsi*, which prevented him from either walking or even standing without crutches, not to the divine interposition which he invoked through the prayers of a holy personage, but to the mere force of imagination.** In like manner he ascribes the equally sudden restoration of a hand, rendered motionless by a complete division of its moving muscles and nerves, not to the effect of faith and prayer to the Almighty, but to the medicinal properties of a sweet-scented moss, that grows at Holywell.†† It is a pity the Vicar does not import into Ireland a sufficient quantity of this moss to cure the impotent limbs of all his countrymen! Finally, he accounts for the in-

* De Procuranda Indorum Salute, l. ii. c. 10. p. 226.

† The work must be inquired for under the title of *Johanna Papissa*, &c. 8vo. c. 29, *Art. Selden*, being bound up with this quaint performance.

‡ Reply, p. 368.

§ P. 369.

|| Ibid.

¶ Reply, p. 376. The Vicar here accuses me of having “forgotten what I admitted in 1805, that Winefred White (the subject of the miracle) remained a fortnight at Holywell *to bathe*, by the advice of her friends.” In return, I accuse him of falsifying my words, which stand thus in the pamphlet alluded to: “Remaining a fortnight longer at Holywell, *she bathed* two or three times more, in compliance with custom, and to satisfy the importunity of her friends, but without any sensible benefit to her health, as, in fact, she was perfectly cured at her first bathing, and enabled to walk, run, and work as well as ever.” Authentic Documents, p. 10. The fact is, many Catholics frequent the well and bathe in it out of pure devotion. This was the case with the three Ladies from Lancashire, whom W. White met there.

** Reply, p. 372.

†† P. 374.

stantaneous cure of that incurable disease, a curvature of the spine, accompanied with a hemiplegia and general debility and torture of the nervous system, to a single immersion in cold water.* But, I appeal to your reflection, Dear Sir, whether after this manner a Deist, or other infidel, would not be able to explain away every miracle mentioned in the Gospel, as easily and as plausibly as the Vicar does the supernatural events in question.†

I have complained in the former part of my letter of the Vicar's passing over several testimonies of the Catholic Fathers, which show their unanimity in vouching for the continuance of miracles in the true Church; and I cannot conclude it without noticing his disingenuity, in suppressing my remarks on the discordance of eminent Protestant writers on this important subject. This was never so conspicuous, as when the learned and eloquent Dr. Conyers Middleton published his *Free Inquiry into the Miraculous powers of the Christian Church*. He himself denied all miracles besides those referred to in the Scriptures. Other Protestant Divines admitted the continuance of them, some during the first age, others during the second and third ages, and others again during the fourth and fifth ages.

* P. 375.

† While the present work has been in the press, namely, on May the third, present year, 1822, a supernatural cure has taken place in the person of Miss Barbara O'Connor, of New Hall, near Chelmsford, which has caused the astonishment of all the Physicians and Surgeons who attended her, among whom was the celebrated anatomist, Mr. Carque, as the disease itself, which consisted in a total deprivation of motion, attended with excruciating pain and prodigious swelling, had baffled their utmost skill for the preceding year and a half. To be brief, they recommended amputation of the limb, as the best thing to be done in so desperate a case, particularly on May second, the day preceding the cure. In the mean time Prince Hohenloghe of Bamberg, whose name is celebrated for the supernatural cures he has wrought, having been applied to by a friend of the young Lady, he promised to say Mass for her at eight o'clock in the morning of that day, May 3d, and directed her to hear Mass and receive the Holy Communion at the same time. This she punctually performed, when suddenly, at the last Gospel of the Mass, she perceived a slight shock in her shoulder, which darted to the extremity of her fingers. In a word, she was perfectly restored to the use of her hand and arm, and freed from the pain with which she had been so long tormented. In a late number of *L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, we have an account of a miraculous cure resembling the last mentioned in many particulars. Mlle. Marie Licol, of Gremonville, in the Lower Seine, aged thirty-eight, had been afflicted with a paralysis of the left arm and hand, which rendered them quite motionless since the year 1815, and withered them to the appearance of a dead limb. Application being made by letter to Prince Hohenloghe, he directed the patient to hear Mass and receive the Holy Communion on Palm Sunday, March 31, in the present year, 1822. She complied, when, immediately after communicating, her hand and arm were restored to their natural powers and healthful appearance. See *L'Ami*, &c. No. 812.

But Middleton, with equal talent and profaneness, closing upon them all, showed that the Ancient Fathers and Church Historians were so wedged in and dove-tailed together, that they must all, of necessity, either be credited or discredited, from SS. Ignatius and Polycarp, the disciples of the Apostles, down to SS. Bernard and Xavier, and from Eusebius down to Bede and William of Malmsbury, and so on through the Catholic Doctors and historians down to the present day. Now, as this continuation of miracles in the Catholic Church cannot be admitted without confessing that she is the *True Church*, more especially as these miracles, according to his just remark, are, for the most part, connected with the Catholic doctrine and practices of the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence in the Eucharist, praying to Saints, the use of Holy Water, the Sign of the Cross, Relicks, &c. the consequence was, that Middleton rejected the Miracles altogether, condemning the Fathers and historians, without exception, as impostors, who "forged the accounts they related, or published what they knew to have been forged by others."* Thus to avoid the greater evil of Popery, as it appeared to the Protestant Doctor, was he led into a System of Scepticism, which undermines the Gospel, and is a libel on human nature. And into this system he seems to have been followed by the Vicar and all succeeding Protestant writers! Thus much is clear, that the Vicar, professing as he does to answer my work, says not a word to the above-stated weighty arguments which it contains. Again; whereas B. Douglas "challenges Catholics" to produce the writing of any Saint, claiming a power of working "miracles," which I answered by referring to passages in the published works of the identical Saints, the Bishop had mentioned SS. Bernard and Xaverus, who both assert that they had exercised that power, the Vicar says not a word to save the honour of his principal champion, or the cause he advocates. The same is to be said of the Bishops and Dr. Paley's denial, that any of "the Popish miracles, as they call them, were wrought to confirm any truth." This I refuted by the authentic history of the above-named Saints, and by the epitaph on S. Augustin's monument, recorded by Bede. And whereas, Dr. Middleton rests the whole credit of his cause on this single point, that "since the Apostles' time there is not in all history one instance, either well attested, or *so much as mentioned*, of any person who had ever exercised, or pretended to exercise, the gift of tongues;" and whereas the Vicar and most other writers have denied this gift to S. Xaverus, in particular, because he did not possess it at his entrance into India,

* Free Inquiry, Introduct. Discourse, p. 14, &c.

I have distinctly refuted all and every one of these positions: nor has the Vicar, with all his pretensions of answering me, been able to say a word in their support.

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XXIII.

On the Language of the Liturgy, and Reading the Scriptures.

DEAR SIR ;—The title of the Vicar's chapter, that I am about to consider, is: *Prayers in an Unknown Tongue*. What, Latin an *unknown tongue*, which is taught in all the schools of Christendom, and understood, not only by every educated man, but also, in a sufficient degree, by the common people of Italy, Spain, France, and all those elsewhere who understand French? The Vicar's controversial ally, Dr. Porteus, is guilty of still greater absurdity and falsehood on this subject, where, speaking of the use of Latin in the liturgy, he says of it: "There cannot be more cruel and wicked cunning, than to keep the poor people in this ignorance."* In the mean time, both the Bishop and the Vicar are perfectly sensible, that it is not the Church which has appointed a language for her liturgy, which the people of certain countries do not understand, but the people of those countries who have forgotten the language of the Church. In a word, these captious disputants quarrel with the Latin Church, for using her own language! The English Church, as I before observed, being a local and a novel Church, acts quite consistently in using the English tongue in her service.† And by the same rule, the Catholic or Universal Church acts right in retaining the ancient and general languages of the civilized world, Greek in the East, and Latin in the West. In the mean time, the latter is so far from being actuated by any *cruel and wicked cunning to keep poor people in ignorance*, that she employs every means in her power, Sermons, Catechisms, Prayer-books, &c. in the vulgar tongues, to supply the defect of those who do not understand hers. So groundless are the pretexts of those, who, being separated from the Centre of Unity and their Mother Church, by the lawless passions of their predecessors, are reduced to seek for an excuse for continuing divided from it!

* Confutat. p. 63.

† End of Controv. Let. xlvii. p. 146.

But says the Vicar : " St. Paul has expressly condemned the practice of praying in an unknown tongue."* To this I have already answered, that Latin is not an unknown language, and, what is most to the purpose, that it is plain from the context of the quoted passage, 1 Cor. xiv.; that the Apostle does not there speak of the language of the liturgy, but of the use made by different Christians of the gift of tongues, which then was common to most of them.† In fact, the Vicar does not dwell on this trite and futile objection, but employs his force and ingenuity in trying to disengage himself from certain novel arguments which I brought in defence of the Catholic discipline, respecting the language of the liturgy. I observed then, that St. Paul himself, whose authority against the Latin Church, for using the Latin language in its liturgy, has been quoted from his first Epistle to the Corinthians, nevertheless wrote a letter to the Church of Rome, which still forms part of her liturgy in the Greek Tongue. The observation embarrasses the Vicar greatly, and he can find no answer to it, but in the gratuitous supposition that the Church of Rome, in the reign of the Emperor Claudius, was well acquainted with Greek!‡ I observed in the next place, that Christ frequented the synagogues in Judea and Galilee, in which the public service was then performed, not in the vulgar Syriac, but in the ancient Hebrew, which the Jews in common did not at that time understand, and that of course Christ, by his presence, sanctioned the practice. The Vicar replies that, as our Saviour sometimes preached in the synagogues, he must have used the vulgar language.§ My answer is, that granting his assertion, while he is forced to allow mine, I clearly gain my point, which is that Christ, during his mortal life, used to be present at and thereby sanctioned divine service in a language not generally understood. Finally, I observed that the modern Greeks, Egyptians, Abyssinians, and other Christian people retain their ancient languages, in their respective liturgies, down to the present time, though these are no longer intelligible to the common people. The Vicar admits the fact; but, without attending to the inconveniences and evils which might result from a change in this particular, peremptorily pronounces it "absurd and inconvenient, and contrary to Scripture."|| I pass over "the conjectures of Voison," with Lightfoot's and Basnages' information on this subject, which answer no other purpose than to swell out the Vicar's chapter, in order to point out an important consequence, resulting from the Vicar's and

* Reply, p. 381.

† End of Controv. Lett. xlvii. p. 148.

‡ Reply, p. 381.

§ P. 384.

|| Reply, p. 390.

the Bishop of St. David's doctrine concerning it. There is no fact of history which the latter is so positive in, as that the Christian Church of Britain was founded by St. Paul,* and the Vicar declares that "His Lordship and Dr. Hales have quite set at rest the question" respecting it.† Now, if this be true, the foundation in question must have taken place before the 12th year of Nero, or the year 65 of the Christian Æra, the date of St. Paul's martyrdom, at which time, it is clear from history, the Britons enjoyed their liberty, and, of course, their language; under their native prince, Arviragus. Now the Bishop and the Vicar are equally positive as to the indispensable necessity of a vernacular language in every Christian Church; the former declaring that "it is a great error to offer up the prayers of the Church in a language not understood by the people;"‡ while the latter, as we have just witnessed, pronounces it *anti-scriptural*,§ the consequence is evident, St. Paul must then have composed a Welsh Common Prayer Book, or other Liturgy, which it belongs to the three above-mentioned Antiquaries to discover, or, at all events, to account for its loss, and to show by what means it was supplanted by the Roman Missal and Pontifical. The same requisition may be imposed on the Vicar, in conjunction with Dr. Ledwich and Dr. Elrington, respecting the original Irish Liturgy.—To such straits are men reduced who are bent on defending a bad cause!

The Vicar's chapter on reading the Scripture, in answer to my letter on the same subject, is evidently defective, confused, and contradictory. What he terms a *Prohibition of the Scriptures*, on the part of the Church, ought to be called *Regulations for preserving the letter and sense of them pure and unchanged*. So far from proscribing the Holy Scriptures, the Church has composed almost the whole of her Liturgy and Divine offices from them; and so far from prohibiting the use of them, she requires her Clergy, from the Sub-deacon, up to the Pope himself, to employ no small portion of each recurring day in an attentive perusal of them. True it is that the last General Council, among the many decrees it made for enforcing the reading, the studying, and the preaching of the Divine word, made some for restraining the license of editors and printers in publishing it without due authority, and that of readers against interpreting it contrary to the unanimous sense of the Fathers: but this only proves the veneration of the Church for the sacred books themselves, and her solicitude that they should answer the purposes

* Protestant's Catechism, p. 13. Grand Schism, p. 2.

† Reply, p. 367.

‡ Prot. Catech. p. 39.

§ Reply, p. 390.

for which they were revealed. It is also true, that among the Rules prefixed to the Roman Index of prohibited books, there is one respecting *Vulgar Translations of the Bible*, in virtue of which a certificate of the good sense and good dispositions of the party desirous of using any of them, was required; nor is it surprising that such a regulation should have been made in the middle of the sixteenth century, considering the religious state of Europe at that period. But this rule was no prohibition of reading the Scripture, even in a modern translation, much less in the originals, or in the approved Vulgate Translation. However, this rule, however reasonable in itself and necessary when it was framed, has now gone into disuse, and accordingly we see in the several cities and towns of this kingdom, different editions of the English Catholic Version of the Scriptures on sale, in folio, quarto, and octavo, which are purchased and read by every Catholic at his discretion, as you, Sir, and every such Catholic are witnesses, to the disgrace of the Vicar's bold assertions to the contrary. This is not the place to discuss the merit of the Catholic Translation; but I repeat it, when the Bishop of Winchester can say nothing worse of it, than that "It contains many Eastern, Greek, and Latin words, so as to be unintelligible to common readers,"* which words the translators professedly retained, in order to keep as close to the originals as possible, it is a proof that this learned Prelate has nothing to object against its fidelity, as Catholics are forced to do with respect to the Common English Bible, after all the corrections it underwent at the beginning of the first James's reign. Neither is this the place to say any thing of the Notes accompanying the original Rheims Testament (which subject the Vicar again introduces in his most acrimonious style), as I have in a former letter answered his objections respecting it.†

In justification of the Regulations of the Council of Trent, and of the conduct of the Church in general, in occasionally laying some restrictions on publishing and reading vulgar translations of the Holy Scriptures, I explained the difference there is between the relative duties of Pastors and their flocks, it being the duty of the former to teach, and of the latter to hear the word of God; I pointed out the danger there is of placing before young and ignorant persons certain books and passages of Scripture, as for example, Solomon's Song, Abraham's entry into Egypt, and Jacob's obtaining Esau's birthright, without an explanation, either verbal or written; I proved from Lord Clarendon's History and Grey's Examination, that the horrors and follies of the Grand Rebellion were, in a great measure, owing

* Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. p. 16.

† Letter vi.

to the unrestrained reading of the Scriptures by ignorant or ill-disposed persons. I traced the mad enthusiasm and impieties of Sweedenborg and Joanna Southcote, in our own days, to the same source.* All these important considerations the Vicar passes by, as unworthy of notice, but continues to rail against the above-mentioned Council, Pope Pius IV, the reigning Pope Pius VII., the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and the present writer, as concurring in their respective ways, to make the Scriptures "a dead letter to the lower orders of Irish Catholics," and preventing "the progress of Religious knowledge among them."† And yet after all this declamation against restrictions on the Bible of every kind, the Vicar himself turns out to be an advocate for some such restrictions. In the first place, he calls for a dissolution of what he calls "the unnatural connection and heterogeneous mixture of Churchmen and Dissenters (among whom he includes the Evangelical Clergy) in the Bible Societies." This connection he represents as "tending to produce apathy about the vital doctrines of Christianity;"‡ on which point he is at open war with the Bishop of St. David's.§ In the second place, he insists on it that "a Prayer-Book (the Common Prayer-Book) should accompany the distribution of the Bible, as a safeguard against the delusions of Calvinistic interpretations."|| This is the very thing with which he reproaches the Catholic Bishops, namely, that they will not consent to distribute the Scriptures without notes, *as a safeguard against the delusions of Protestant interpretation*, with this difference, however, that the Catholic Bishops speak in conformity with their principles, while the Vicar speaks in opposition to his. Lastly, he concurs with Bishop Mant in "recommending a diligent but *judicious distribution of the Bible*, accompanied with the book of Common Prayer, while he *disapproves of a boundless circulation of it*, without regard to circumstances."¶

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

LETTER XXIV.

Clerical Continency.

DEAR SIR:—Before the closing of what the Vicar calls, *A Reply to the End of Religious Controversy*, he is pleased to start a fresh subject of debate, which is not treated of in that work.

* End of Controv. Letter xlvii.

† Reply, p. 397.

‡ Reply, p. 399.

§ Reply, p. 393, 397.

§ Grand Schism, p. 33, &c.

¶ Reply, p. 398.

True it is that its author, in speaking of the still remaining errors in the Common Bible, mentions the words of our Saviour in commendation of continence: Οὐ παντί χαρίζεται λαλῶν ταῦτα: *all men DO NOT receive this saying*, Mat. xix. 11, which he maintained were erroneously translated, *All men CANNOT receive this saying*, by Luther, Tyndal, Coverdale, and Cranmer, in excuse for their common violation of the law of continence, by which they were bound.* It is also true that the author, in mentioning this error, has stated that "The Rev. Mr. Grier and Dr. Ryan have the confidence to deny this and another glaring error, where AND is placed for OR: 1 Cor. xi. 27, because they pretend to prove that the *cup is necessary*, and that *continence is not necessary*."† To judge of the truth of this statement, [which provokes the Vicar beyond measure, in consequence of his refusal to admit the word *continence*, in its strict theological sense,‡ as distinct from *chastity*,] it is necessary that you and my other readers should consult the former writers, *Answer to Ward*. Sect. ii. and Sect. vi., and the latter's *Analysis of Ward's Errata*; in the mean time, the Vicar's pretence that DO NOT and CANNOT mean the same thing, is evidently a perversion of language and common-sense; which is only heightened by his attempt to excuse it where he denies that "continence proceeds from man's free will," because, says he, "it were superfluous for the best men to ask it, as a divine favour, if they could impart it to themselves."§ I do not stop to draw the conclusions which follow from these alarming principles of the Vicar. Let it suffice to say, that they are the same with, or nearly allied to those of his parent Reformer, quoted above.

To answer the Vicar on a new subject, which he has studiously perplexed, it is necessary to make various distinctions. First, then, the Catholic Church teaches, after the Apostle, that *Marriage is honourable in all*; namely in all who are free to marry: and accordingly she ranks it among her Sacraments, and holds it to be absolutely indissoluble, except by death: but then, secondly she also teaches, with the same Apostle, that

* The first-mentioned Reformer, and the father of the rest, Luther, was not ashamed to preach as follows: "As it is not in my power to cease to be a man, so it is not in my power to be without a woman: it is as necessary as to eat, drink, blow the nose, &c." *Serm. de Matrim.* Tom. v. Wittemb. "He that resolves to be without a woman, let him lay aside the nature of a man and make himself an Angel or Spirit." *Epist. ad Wolfgang.* And yet he elsewhere acknowledges, that when he was a Catholic and lived in his monastery, he observed chastity, punishing his body with watching, fasting, and prayer. *Luth. in Ep. Ad. Galat.*

† End of Controv., Letter ix. p. 72.

‡ Galat. v. 23. Vulgate Summa, S. Thom. Aquin. Johnson's Dict.

§ Reply, p. 402.

there are some persons who are not free to marry: namely, those who have voluntarily vowed continency: of whom the Apostle pronounces, *when they have grown wanton in Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have made void their first faith.* 1 Tim. v. 12. Thirdly, believing as she does, still following St. Paul, that the state of Virginity is more perfect than the married state, inasmuch as *He, who is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world and is divided; while he that is unmarried is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord.* 1 Cor. vii.; she prefers the latter to the former, in enlisting recruits for her sacred ministry, the wisdom of which choice she has ever experienced,* and even her declared adversaries have sometimes acknowledged.† Fourthly, though some few instances occur, in certain times and places of clergymen being allowed, in the Latin Church, to retain the wives they had married before their ordination, yet no instance occurs, either in the Latin or in the Greek Church, of a clergyman, in the higher orders, being allowed to marry *after* his consecration or ordination, and to continue exercising his ministry. It seems unnecessary to observe, that these restrictions upon matrimony, do not regard the Protestant clergy, as they have neither taken upon themselves the vow or obligation of celibacy, nor does their church impose it upon them.

Having *disposed* of these matters, to use the Vicar's phrase, I proceed to inquire into the origin which he is pleased to assign to Clerical Celibacy, in doing which I should be glad to know which of the accusations he considers the lighter, *gross ignorance of Church-history and the Canon laws, or the wilful misrepresentation of them*, in order that I may shape my charge against him conformably with it. To be brief, the origin which he assigns to Clerical Celibacy, and the conclusion which he draws from his dissertation upon it, to use his own words, is this: "If we must determine the origin of this *innovation*, we shall have to trace it to the monkery of the dark ages. To the ambitious Hildebrand, Gregory VII., are we to attribute its establishment. Indeed, to such a man could it alone belong to subject the Church to the See of Rome, &c."‡ It is to be observed,

* See Letters to a Prebend., Let. iii.

† The first Act of Parliament, which authorized the marriage of Clergymen in this Kingdom, acknowledged what follows: "It were not only better for the estimation of Priests and other Ministers to live chaste, sole, and separately, from the company of women, and the bond of marriage, but also that they might thereby the better intend to the administration of the Gospel, and be the less intricated and troubled with the charge of household, &c."

‡ Edward VI. c. 21.

§ Reply, p. 405.

that this great and good Pontiff, the scourge of simony and incontinence, was elected in 1073, and died in 1085 : it now remains to be discussed between the Vicar and me, whether the Church laws, requiring the Clergy to lead a single life, are or are not anterior to the former year, or whether they were then, for the first time, enacted ? In support of his theory the Vicar urges, first, that St. Peter was a married man, because mention is made by St. Matthew of his wife's mother. This is true : but, if the wife was living when St. Peter was called to the Apostleship, he had left her, since he was enabled to tell his master : *Behold we have left all things and followed thee* : which conduct in, *leaving the Wife*, among other things, to follow him, Christ approves of in his answer to St. Peter : *Every one that hath left house, or bretheren, or wife for my sake, shall receive a hundred-fold*. Mat. xix. 29. In short, we are expressly told by S. Jerom, the best informed of the Apostolic biographers, that those Apostles who had wives before their call, lived apart from them afterwards.* The Vicar argues, secondly, that S. Patrick's father, Calphurnius, was a deacon, and his grandfather a Priest. I have elsewhere shown, that Calphurnius and his wife separated by mutual consent, *for the sake of leading a chaste life*.† But if he and his father Potitus had cohabited with their wives till their dissolution, what would this prove against the law of Clerical Celibacy, unless it were shown that they acted conformably with Catholic discipline. The next observation applicable to the Vicar's third argument for the lawfulness of Bishops and Priests marrying in the ancient Church, is, that Gildas, lamenting the vices of his native Clergy in the sixth century, said that "Some of the Bishops, not content with one wife, had many wives," and that "the British and Welsh Clergy, in the twelfth century, contrived to make their sons succeed them as well in their spiritual as in their temporal estates, and finally, that in the beginning of the thirteenth century the *abuse prevailed* to a greater degree in Ireland. "Here," continues the Vicar "is a mass of testimony, to prove that, although that imperious Pontiff, Gregory VII., had subjected the Church to the Papal See, by enforcing the celibacy of the Clergy on the Continent, yet that for upwards of a century after his time, sons and grand children used to succeed their fathers and grandfathers in their ecclesiastical benefices in these Islands."‡ Such is the Vicar's mass of testimony (for literally he says nothing more than this) to prove that "the origin of the innovation (clerical celi-

* S. Hieron. Ep. 50.

† An Inquiry into Vulgar Errors concerning Ireland, p.172, 2d edit.

‡ Reply, p. 304.

bacy) is traced to the monkery of the dark ages," and that "to the ambitious Hildebrand, Gregory VII., are we to attribute its establishment." With as good reason might any writer produce the Newgate Calendar, to prove that robbery and forgery are now lawful.

In opposition to this alleged mass of evidence, I will place, in the most contracted form I can, some few of the proofs I have elsewhere brought, that clerical celibacy was the general law of the Church in all ages. The second Council of Carthage, held in 428, refers the establishment of this law to the *Apostles* themselves, in confirming the decree that "all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, shall abstain from marriage."* The same is the ordinance of the other Councils referred to below. Origen says, that "it belongs to him alone to offer sacrifice, who has devoted himself to unceasing and perpetual chastity."† Venerable Bede says the same thing, arguing from the temporary continency of the Levitical Priests, for the necessity of perpetual continency in the Christian Priesthood.‡ S. Jerom testifies that in the three great Patriarchates of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, no persons were received among the Clergy but such as were single men, or who were entirely separated from their wives.§ The learned Church historian, Fleury, says, that the first instance he had been able to discover of a Catholic Priest's pretending to marry, was that of Angelric, a Priest of Chalons, in the year 893; but that the people proceeded to acts of violence against him, and the Bishop excommunicated him for so doing.||

Is it possible that the Vicar should have been ignorant of all this doctrine of the Fathers, and of all these Canons of the Councils, when he wrote that "the origin of this innovation (clerical celibacy) is to be attributed to the monkery of the dark ages, and the ambition of Gregory VII.?" And yet he must stand charged with this gross ignorance, or with a fouler stain, that of publishing a known falsehood. Let us now hear the Vicar's *conjectures*, on which he builds his revolting falsehood, of Pope Gregory VII. being the author of clerical celibacy, in place of

* "Ut quod Apostoli docuerunt et ipsa servavit antiquitas omnibus placet ut Episcopi, Presbyteri Diaconi etiam ab uxoribus contineant." II. Carthag. can. 3. Labb. Concil. t. ii. p. 1052. See also Concil Illiberit, can. 33; I. Concil Nicen., can. 3; II. Concil. Arelat. can. 2. See also the decrees of the Council of London, over which A. B. Plegmund presided, in 994. apud Spelman. See also the second decree of the Council of Entram, A.D. 1000; Labbe, t. ix. p. 797. See likewise the fifteenth chapter of the Council of Winchester, Labbe, t. x. p. 312.

† Orig. Homil. xxiii. in num.

‡ Bed. in. Luc. c. 1.

§ Advers. Vigilant. Testimonies to the same purport can be produced from a long list of other Fathers.

|| Hist. Eccl. l. 54.

authorities, to which, indeed, he does not lay any pretension. He says: "to such a man, Gregory VII., could it alone belong to subject the Church to the See of Rome, and then to compel temporal Princes to submit to the Church. We know, gigantic as the enterprise was, how successfully it was executed. By emancipating the Church from the temporal power, this haughty Pontiff was enabled to destroy the dependence of the ecclesiastics on their respective Sovereigns. To no purpose did the German and French Bishops denounce the Papal decree, as requiring what was repugnant to the word of God and the doctrine of the Apostles. In vain did they urge their liability to the same temptations and infirmities as other men: Gregory was inflexible, &c."* What a mass of groundless imaginations have we here! William the Conqueror, who reigned at this time, was so far from finding his power infringed by the observance of clerical celibacy, that he strongly supported it, as it appears by the acts of different Councils in his dominions, both in England and on the Continent, and by the testimony of the Pope himself.† The Emperor Henry IV., though he strongly contested with Gregory the decree of the Roman Council against simony, did not object to that respecting the Continence of the superior Clergy. On the other hand, the Pope, in his letters on this subject, to the Emperor, and the different Bishops, so far from professing to introduce an innovation in this matter, every where appeals to the decrees of the ancient Councils and Fathers, and to the known laws of the Church concerning it.‡ Nor is there more truth in what the Vicar says about the German and French Bishops "denouncing the Papal decree to be contrary to the word of God, &c.;" so far from this, those Bishops held Synods at Erford, Poitiers, Winchester, and other places, to enforce the decree of that held in Rome in 1074, on this matter, against the *concubinary Priests* in their respective Diocesses.

I am yours, &c.

J. M., D.D.

* Reply, p. 405.

† Epist. l. ix. Ep. 5.

‡ Writing to the Emperor Henry IV. concerning the Council he had held at Rome against Simony and Incontinency in Clergymen, the Pope says, "Nihil novi, nihil ad inventionem nostram statuentes, sed primam et unicam Ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ regulam et tritam Sanctorum viam, relicto errore, repetendam et sectandam esse censuimus." Labbe, t. x. p. 138.

LETTER XXV.

Conclusion.

DEAR SIR:—Here the Vicar concludes what he calls, *A Reply to the End of Religious Controversy*; and here I finish my *Vindication* of that work. Which of us has succeeded, and which of us has failed in his undertaking, it does not most decidedly belong to either of us to pronounce. I trust, then, that in case my Reverend opponent is encouraged by his Right Hon. patrons to take up again the polemic quill against me, he will not be encouraged to resume that unparalleled style of boasting, in which he concluded the *Prefatory Remarks* to his present performance;* as such a style is not less ridiculous than it is insulting. To me, indeed, this Gentleman does not appear to have proved a single point he has taken in hand: at all events it is evident that his book is no answer to mine, as he quite overlooks the scope and principal contents of it. To refute this, the Vicar ought to have proved that *written laws*, of any kind, can have force without the admission of *previous unwritten laws*, or that they can produce their intended effect; the peace and order of the society for which they are made, without Judges to *interpret their meaning*; and Magistrates to *enforce their observance*. Until this be proved, the Vicar must necessarily admit that *Tradition is a Rule of Faith*, no less than *Scripture*, and that the *Pastors of the Church* have authority, at all times, to *pronounce on the sense* of both these Rules; which implies that an opposition to her doctrine, or a pretended *Reformation of her Faith*, can never be lawful or practicable. He was bound, moreover, to show, that, upon his principle, the Divine Founder of the Christian Religion *wrote his law*, and *sent his Apostles* to the ends of the earth, loaded with *copies of the New Testament*, for the instruction of the converts they were to make, and of their successors till the end of time; in which case, as the Vicar is not less convinced than the Bishop of St. David's is, that the Church of Britain was founded by St. Paul, we should have a right to call upon him for the production of an Apostolical Welsh Testament, or, at least, for an ac-

* The Rev. Mr. Grier, speaking generally of the Catholic writers, and alluding particularly to Dr. M., says: "Levity, fallacy, and folly, minutely characterize them, and while they seem to forget the humiliating defeats, which Popery, in all its forms, has sustained since the era of the Reformation, they daily appear to court fresh disaster and multiplied disgrace." Reply, Pref. Rem. p. 46.

count of its disappearance and being supplanted by the Latin Vulgate. A no less difficult task remained for him to prove, namely, that the great bulk of men and women, in different times and different countries, when they have learnt to read the Scriptures, are capable of understanding them, and of making some consistent system or Creed from them : nay, that the most learned and best intentioned Christians themselves have been, and are able to agree in any one system or principle of Protestantism, during these three hundred years of its existence, except in their common disobedience and opposition to their real Mother, the Holy Catholic Church. And yet, without proving all this, the arguments in *The End of Controversy*, against admitting each man's private interpretation of Scripture, as the true Rule of Faith, and the necessity of recurring to the tradition and authority of that Church remain in full force. Among other arguments there stated, in support of this conclusion, there is an obvious and striking one, which therefore called for the Vicar's particular notice, I mean the peace of mind and security of conscience which Catholics experience during life, and at the approach of death, by relying on the faith of the Church, while the contrary, as might be expected, is the case with those who, rejecting that Rule, trust to their own uncertain and varying opinions. This, as I said, and as many respectable authors have said before me, is most observable in the latter of these states. In fact, I called upon Dr. Porteus and his fellow polemics, to name a Catholic who, on his death-bed, expressed a doubt of the truth of his Religion, or a wish to die in any other than the Catholic communion : while instances of free and uninfluenced conversion to the Catholic faith, in that situation, have constantly occurred, and are constantly occurring.* To all this, which forms the first part of my work, the Vicar makes no answer ; except that the Church of England has adopted *the True Canon of Scripture*, and that her *authorized translation* of it into English is *free from error*. On both these points, I however have shown that he contradicts himself : while both of them may be granted, without affecting my main object and principal arguments.

The second part of my work shows an easier and more familiar way of arriving at *The End of Religious Controversy*, than that of investigating *the Right Rule of Faith* ; namely, that of attending to *the Marks of the True Church*, as they are acknowledged by Protestants, no less than by Catholics, in *the Apostles and Nicene Creeds*, which marks I enlarged upon, and applied to the communions in question. Of these, the Vicar

* *End of Controv.* Let. xi. p. 115.

only contents those of *Unity* and *Catholicity*. He makes no pretensions to the existence of any kind of *Unity* among Protestants, but contents himself with denying this mark to the Catholics, on account of the Schisms, which have sometimes heretofore existed between rival Pontiffs and their adherents: I shall say nothing more of this subject, as I have already treated of it at length,* and in so doing have been necessitated to expose some of the Vicar's fraudulent dealings respecting it. Of the other mark of *Catholicity*, I shall say a few more words, after observing that the bulk of the Vicar's book is levelled at the third part of mine, which third part I professed to write, *ex abundanti*, as the term is, in as much as the question at issue, among the rival communions, is decided in the two former parts. In short, the Vicar rehearses, once more, the old misrepresentations and impieties against the Catholic tenets, which have been echoed from Luther and Calvin, to Jewel and Claude, and from these to Tillotson and Porteus, being the same which have, each time, been repelled and refuted by Bellarmine and Perron, by Bossuet and Arnauld, by Hawarden and Challoner, and last of all by the writer of *The End of Controversy*.

The Vicar's last and desponding effort consists of an attempt to prove that THE CATHOLIC CHURCH *is not the Catholic Church, and ought not to be called the Catholic Church.*† To make out this, he quotes one *Shoel's Tableau* from an Irish newspaper, which states, that "the Catholics are to the Protestants of different communions, in the ratio of somewhat less than two and a half to two."‡ But to what purpose do Shoel and the Vicar crowd together Religionists of the most discordant creeds and discipline,§ Socinians, Arians, Anabaptists, Quakers, Harnhutters, Dunkers, Shakers, Ranters, Antinomians, Swedenborgians, Joannites, and fifty sects over and above those that are enumerated by Evans and Bellamy;|| to what purpose, I

* See above Letter vi. and Letter xx. Reply, p. 407.

† Reply, p. 408.

‡ Ibid. The Vicar's lengthened appeal to the "pure and ancient Syrian (Eutychian) Churches in India, of *Apostolic origin*, p. 413, &c.," is fatal to his cause; as they agree with the Great Catholic Church, in every thing, except in acknowledging the Pope's Supremacy, and in confounding Christ's human with his divine nature, for which all Protestants, who know any thing of the matter, condemn them equally with Catholics. When the Vicar denies that "Dr. Buchanan was jealous of the number of the Catholics in India, he refutes himself, in as much as he acknowledges that the Doctor's object was to secure the co-operation of the Syrian Church, in order to counteract the influence of the See of Rome, and to effect an union of that Church with the Church of England," p. 412, in both which points he completely failed.

§ Reply, p. 409.

|| Among these, some sects expressly deny the necessity of Baptism, as well as of the Eucharist; others, as the Antinomians, or rigid Method-

say, does he cite them, if, so far from any one of them vying with the original Church in numbers, duration, or extent, they are not, when all put together, any way equal to it in *number*, and much less in either of the other particulars. Nor is this all that is to be taken into consideration, in the present comparison. In a word, the Catholics throughout the world are strictly united in one and the same religion. Consisting, as they do, of so many hundreds of millions of persons, spread over the face of the globe, they all believe the *same articles of faith*, they all worship God by the *same liturgy* of the Mass, and the seven Sacraments; they are all obedient to the *same ecclesiastical authority*. On the other hand, to view the most respectable and orderly society of those who have separated themselves from the *centre of Unity*, how difficult is it to find two well-instructed persons, professing themselves members of it, who agree together on its fundamental articles! Where shall we find one such, among its very heads, who professes to believe strictly in a Creed, which he is required solemnly to pronounce before God and man thirteen times in the year? It is notorious that the persons alluded to are *not agreed as to the very Deity they worship*; and that one party of them consider the other party of their fellow Church-men and Kirk-men, as *Idolaters* and *Blasphemers*, for paying *supreme worship to Jesus Christ, as God*, while the latter party regard the former as *Apostates* and *Anti-christians*, for refusing him this supreme adoration! And are these Religionists members of the *same Church*, though they meet together within the same walls, to repeat the same forms of prayer? And will any one, with these notorious facts before his eyes, lay claim to *Catholicity* in favour even of the most respectable and the best denomination of Protestants? Then with respect to the worship of the latter, how comparatively small is the number of those who approach to that ordinance, which they profess to believe is "generally necessary for salvation!"†

But to return to the contemplation of the Catholic Church;

ists, deny they are under any obligation of keeping the Ten Commandments, or the laws of the State. The HERNHUTTERS or MORAVIANS reject prayer, acts of charity, and other good works, being at all useful to salvation. The JOANNITES hold Joan. Southcote was as necessary for the above-mentioned purpose as Christ himself.

* The Athanasian creed.

† See Catechism in the Common Prayer Book on the two Sacraments.—Out of a population of twenty thousand, the real number of the inhabitants of the town in which the author resides, it appears, upon a diligent inquiry, that not more than about two hundred and fifty persons received the Sacrament in both the Churches of it, at the last Easter, including Good Friday.

as it is not in the power of the Vicar, nor of all the above-named sectaries put together, to deprive her of her right to that glorious name of CATHOLIC or *Universal*, by which she has been distinguished from the followers of particular men, and the Religionists of particular countries, in every age, and in every place, so it is in vain that he spends his breath and his ink, in idle protestations against the *exclusive* application of a name, which can only belong to one Church, namely, to that which alone is *Catholic* or *Universal*. The great S. Augustine said above fourteen centuries ago: "Among other things which keep me in the bosom of the Catholic Church—the very name of CATHOLIC, which, amidst so many heresies, this Church alone possesses, keeps me there." Similar are the testimonies of SS. Justin, Cyril, Pacian, Salvian, and the Fathers in general; these cannot be effaced or denied, however grating they are to the ears of the Rev. Vicar. In like manner, it is vain in him to sneer at, unless he can answer the challenge of the learned convert Dr. Bayly, son of the Bishop of Bangor, who having called in vain upon his Protestant adversaries to name the time and the place, the means, and the other circumstances of the pretended change of the Protestant into the Catholic Religion, very justly observes that this change could not have happened in any age, since that of the Apostles, except by many millions of Christians throughout the world going to bed on some one night, with one set of religious principles, and awaking the next morning with different, and even opposite principles. For if the alleged change had taken place by degrees, as the Vicar insinuates, violent dissensions and commotions must have ensued between those who retained one Religion, and those who embraced the other; as happened at the period of the Reformation, so called. The impossibility of the alleged change, at least, between the fifth century and the sixteenth, is farther demonstrated by the striking circumstance that the Nestorians and the Eutychians possessing large and flourishing Bishoprics and Patriarchates, throughout Asia, and the Northern and Eastern parts of Africa, comprehending also the Vicar's "pure and Apostolical Syrian Churches on the Malabar Coast," broke off from the great Catholic Church on opposite principles, in the middle of the fifth century; and yet they continue to profess Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Seven Sacraments, the Invocation of Saints, and Prayers for the Dead, as firmly as Catholics do. After showing when, where, and how Catholics changed their Religion, it will remain for the Vicar to show how these millions of hostile Nestorians and Eutychians altered theirs: In a word, there is no way whatsoever of accounting for this, but by supposing that all the members of these oppo-

site heresies slept away their former Religion, on the same night that the Catholics did theirs.

In closing this long controversy, I take leave to address my Reverend opponent in the words of the illustrious Doctor and Martyr, S. Cyprian, to one of his adversaries : "you have now my book, and I have yours : each of them will be produced before the tribunal of Christ at the day of judgment."* Alas ! what will fame, what will patronage, what will preferment avail us, should we then be found to have misapplied the talents entrusted to us, by disguising instead of illustrating His revealed truths, to the loss of our own and other immortal souls, for which He shed His precious blood !

I am, Dear Sir,
Your's in Christ,
J. M., D.D.

* "Habes tu literas meas, et ego tuas. In die judicii, ante tribunal Christi, utrumque recitabitur." S. Cyp. Pupiano. Lib. iv. Epist. 9.

FINIS.

2 B

GRAND FOLIO HAYDOCK BIBLE,

Under the Patronage of the Right Reverend Dr. CONWELL, the most Reverend ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE, with the concurrence of other Bishops, and under the immediate inspection of Catholic Clergymen, now publishing, by EUGENE CUMMISKEY, and complete in 120 weekly numbers, of sixteen pages each; Price 25 cents per number. The whole embellished with 20 well finished Engravings, and forming the most abundant resources of Biblical knowledge ever published in one work. (Twenty numbers are now printed.)

EUGENE CUMMISKEY'S

Catalogue of Catholic Standard Stereotyped Publications for the Years 1823-4.

Challoner's quarto edition of the DOWAY BIBLE, with ten engravings,	\$10 00
Challoner's octavo edition of the DOWAY BIBLE,	5 00
Butler's LIVES OF THE SAINTS, in 12 vols. embellished with forty highly finished engravings. To this edition is attached the Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, which is not given in the English edition,	24 00
DOWAY TESTAMENT, with Dr. Challoner's notes,	1 25
THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, by Dr. Milner, to which is attached, a postscript by himself, not published in this country before, with an appropriate engraving,	2 00
THE INSTRUCTION OF YOUTH IN CHRISTIAN PIETY, by Charles Gobinet, D. D.	2 00
THE CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTED IN THE CEREMONIES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By the Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner,	75
WARD'S TREATISE, showing the difference between the Catholic and Protestant Version of the Sacred Scriptures,	1 25
THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST, a very neat pocket edition, translated from the Latin of Thomas a Kempis, by the Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner,	50
THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT, a neat pocket edition,	50
TRUE PIETY, a prayer book, new edition, decidedly the best compilation ever yet published.	
CHRISTIAN'S GUIDE, a prayer book.	
THINK WELL ON'T; or, CONSIDERATIONS ON THE FOUR LAST THINGS. By Bishop Challoner,	37
FOUNDATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE,	25
Bossuet's EXPOSITION OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE,	37
THE HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION,	25
FIFTY REASONS,	37
Hay's ABRIDGMENT OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE,	37
SMALL CATECHISMS, per dozen,	50



